



THE  
SANDFORD FLEMING  
LIBRARY



EX -

LIBRIS



0000

~~178~~

100  
=





THE SERMON  
ON THE MOUNT



# THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

BY THE REV.  
HORACE MARRIOTT, M.A., D.D.  
KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD

WITH A PREFACE BY THE LADY MARGARET  
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AT OXFORD

REV. K. M. BLOCK, D. D.  
6340 ELLENWOOD AVE.  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

ἸΑΝΑΚΡΙΝΟΝΤΕΣ Τὰς ΓΡΑΦὰς

LONDON  
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING  
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NEW YORK AND TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.

*Printed in Great Britain*

1925

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL  
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY





BT

380

M35

1923

96 - B 3756

WHA

## PREFACE

I HAVE been asked to say a few words of preface to this book and I do so very gladly, not merely out of loyalty to a former pupil, but far more out of the sense of its great value which a careful reading of it has created in me.

It is an attempt to reproduce the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord (as far as this is possible in Greek) and to estimate their essential meaning and their permanent value. In the first part a critical attempt is made to reconstruct, by means of a comparison of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the Sermon on the Mount as it existed in the source from which they both probably drew it (Q). This is done with a most careful and meticulous examination of every verse, as well as with a sane and balanced judgment, and the resultant sermon is then printed in full. Then follows an estimate of the influences which led our Lord to throw His early teaching into this form, of the reasons which can make us feel confident that the record really preserves that teaching, of its significance at the time when it was first delivered, and of its special message to our own age—all this treated with courage and with reverence and with a good knowledge of the modern objections to Christian Ethics.


The book will thus appeal to the critic and to the preacher : the critic will be led on by the critical treatment to wish to read the more general estimate : the preacher will perhaps do wisely to read the last three chapters first : he will find them full of suggestive thoughts for his teaching, and any Christian seeking guidance for his own life will find in them much to clear his thought and to deepen his spiritual allegiance.

WALTER LOCK.

CHRIST CHURCH,  
OXFORD.

*Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity.*

Nov. 6, 1924.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation



## AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE very high costs of publication at present ruling dictate to an author the cultivation of the utmost brevity and terseness of expression which he can command. Consequently there are in this book many arguments and observations, baldly stated only and barely set down, which, had space not been such an important consideration, might have been more fully developed and elaborated. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured, in the following pages, to write a fairly complete treatise on the Sermon on the Mount : critical, exegetical, and expository. This, it seems to me, is the sort of work that is needed nowadays; not mere criticism, nor exposition without scientific background, but the judicious and scholarly combination of the three.

It may be thought that there is not much in the book that is original. I have never sought after novelty or originality for its own sake, but have been guided by an honest search after truth. But everything in the following pages represents independent thought. Even the list of parallels in Chapter X is no mere reproduction of other lists, but has been compiled from my own reading of the original documents. I have based my work on the documentary theory, and have thought it well to give, very briefly, in the opening chapters, what appear to me some cogent reasons for postulating a single written source behind the non-Marcan matter common to Matthew and Luke. But, whilst dismissing the oral hypothesis as accounting for the variations and similarities of our Gospels *in their present form*, I freely recognise that behind all our written material there was an oral tradition, and that the remembrance of our Lord's words in the minds of His hearers is the ultimate basis of our records.

To some of my readers much of the contents of these introductory chapters will I fear be mere *crambe repetita*. But I would ask their indulgence on the ground that I have had in view, not only the specialist in the Synoptic Problem, but also the general reader to whom the standard works in which the grounds for the documentary theory are fully worked out may not be familiar or easily accessible.

In the critical portion of the work I have tried to avoid undue subjectivity, and to abstain from anything of the nature of plausible guess-work. As far as possible, I have sought for objective proof in a department of inquiry in which the materials for such are often very difficult to find. Sir John Hawkins' work on the Synoptic Problem has been a great help and inspiration to me, and I have set it before me as a model of method and thoroughness. Nevertheless, I am far from claiming to have succeeded in authoritatively reconstructing the Q text of the Sermon. I am well aware of the uncertainty which must attach to the results of any attempt to do so. But, notwithstanding, it seemed worth while to make the attempt.

In the exegetical part of the work I have sought to pay due attention to the insight into the primary meaning of our Lord's words which is afforded by the Jewish literature. In this department of study I have derived much assistance from Dean Savage's 'The Gospel of the Kingdom.' I anticipate criticism for not including within the scope of this part of the book the whole of our two Gospel records of the Sermon. In these, it will probably be urged, we have precise and well-known entities, whereas in the reconstructed text of the author we have an uncertain subjective one that may satisfy nobody but himself. For this reason, an exegetical commentary on the author's hypothetical Sermon, as distinct from the actual Sermon of the Evangelists, is too incomplete to be of much value. I feel the force of this criticism. Nevertheless, I am persuaded that there are at least some good reasons for preferring the course which I have pursued.

In the first place, whilst I fully recognise the possibility that no one of my readers will entirely agree with my reconstructed text in every detail, at the same time

I anticipate that very few will be of the opinion that every saying in our Gospel accounts of the Sermon actually formed part of it, and I hope that most will see in my reconstruction at least a step towards the recovery of the actual historical discourse.

Secondly, the method I have adopted has given to the book a unity of aim and a natural development which it would otherwise have lacked. As it is, it goes forward steadily, step by step, to its close ; inquiring, first, What did Q's Sermon actually contain, and what did our Lord actually say ? Then, What exactly did these words of His convey to the first hearers ? And, finally, How do they stand in relation to His teaching as a whole, and what is the substance of their import and message for us to-day ?

Thirdly, whilst from one point of view the value of the exegesis is no doubt diminished by its limitation to the words of a critical reconstruction, from another it is I believe greatly increased. When we frame a critical text by combining, eliminating, and rearranging the matter in our sources, the general tenor of the teaching is modified, its characteristics and limitations are brought into relief, and many sayings are seen in a new light. The separation of passages from their old contexts, and the placing of them into new ones, suggests fresh interpretations of them. All this is valuable in proportion as the critical work on which it is based is sound.

The principles upon which I have gone have been these :—first, spare no effort to make your critical results as safe and sure as you can ; secondly, what your criticism has put asunder, let not your exegesis join together again ; but trust your reconstruction implicitly, and seek to build as high as possible upon the foundation you have laid. No doubt, it would have been possible, while following out these principles, to have also included separately a consideration of the various eliminated passages, endeavouring first by critical methods to find their true place in the Ministry, and then basing the exegesis of them upon their new contexts. This would be a task of much interest and value. But to have attempted it in the present volume would have detracted from that unity of aim to which we



have already alluded, and it would also have unduly increased the size of the book. Besides, it seems more properly to belong to other works, carried out on similar lines.

For if, by the methods we have adopted, we have in any degree succeeded in elucidating the teaching of one important block of discourse matter, then, by the application of the same methods to other blocks, similar results could doubtless be obtained. The gain would be a gradual development and deepening of our understanding and appreciation of the whole teaching of our Lord in relation to the historical course of His Ministry. It is as a small contribution towards this great end that I have consistently envisaged the present work. Whether or not I have succeeded I must leave it to the judgment of my readers to decide.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am greatly indebted to the Rev. E. A. Wesley and the Rev. J. W. Tyrer for assistance and encouragement at all times most freely given ; to the Bishop of Gloucester for his suggestions and advice ; and to Professor Lock, who first directed my thoughts to the specialised study of the Sermon on the Mount, for his kindness in writing the Preface to this book.

ECCLESTON, *December* 1924.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE BY PROFESSOR LOCK . . . .	v
AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION . . . .	vii

## INTRODUCTORY.—GENERAL

CHAPTER

I.	THE PROBABLE SOURCE OF THE NON-MARCAN MATTER COMMON TO MATTHEW AND LUKE	1
II.	THE PROBABLE ORDER OF Q . . . .	13
III.	THE PROBABLE EXTENT AND WORDING OF Q TABLES AND STATISTICS . . . .	21 30

## PART I.—CRITICAL

IV.	THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN THE MINISTRY, AND THE PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED . . . . .	42
	SYNOPSIS OF THE INTRODUCTIONS TO THE SERMON . . . . .	52
V.	THE SERMON MATTER PARALLELED IN MARK, AND THE SERMON DOUBLETS . . . .	53
VI.	THE MATTER COMMON TO THE TWO RE- PORTS OF THE SERMON, AND THE MATTER IN THE SERMON OF THE ONE EVANGELIST WHICH IS PLACED IN OTHER CONTEXTS BY THE OTHER . . . . .	61

CHAPTER	PAGE
VII. THE MATTER IN THE SERMON OF THE ONE EVANGELIST WHICH THE OTHER NOWHERE RECORDS . . . . .	72
VIII. THE DETAILED WORDING AND ORDER OF Q'S SERMON . . . . .	101
RECONSTRUCTED TEXT OF Q'S SERMON .	126
IX. THE SERMON OF Q AND THE HISTORICAL SERMON . . . . .	132

## PART II.—EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY

X. PARALLELS AND AFFINITIES TO THE SERMON IN THE PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH LITERATURE	141
XI. THE PRIMARY MEANING OF THE SERMON .	169
XII. THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN THE TEACH- ING OF CHRIST . . . . .	206
XIII. THE VALUE AND IMPORT OF THE TEACHING OF THE SERMON . . . . .	229
PRINCIPAL WORKS USED OR CITED . . .	267
INDEX OF THE SERMON PASSAGES . . .	269
INDEX OF SERMON WORDS AND PHRASES .	271
INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS . . .	273



# THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

## INTRODUCTORY—GENERAL

### CHAPTER I

#### THE PROBABLE SOURCE OF THE NON-MARCAN MATTER COMMON TO MATTHEW AND LUKE

Of a Discourse of our Lord related to have been delivered to His disciples during the earlier period of His Galilaean Ministry we have two accounts in the Gospels. The longer, containing 107 verses, is recorded in Mt. 5<sup>3-7</sup> 27, and the shorter, containing 29½ verses, in Lk. 6<sup>20b-49</sup>. Our other two Evangelists have preserved no record of the Discourse, although Mark contains, in different contexts, a few parallels to the Sermon as recorded by Matthew.<sup>a</sup> The aim of our critical inquiry is to travel as far as possible behind the reports of the Evangelists towards the words actually used by our Lord. A highly important step towards this end would be accomplished if the text of the Sermon as it stood in the source or sources of the First and Third Evangelists could be recovered, and the effort to do this, as far as it is possible, will be the main purpose of the earlier part of this book. Having arrived at a reconstructed text, we shall proceed to draw inferences from it as to the probable contents of the historical Discourse.

The whole subject-matter of the Sermon can be readily classified as follows: (1) the matter common to the Sermons of the First and Third Evangelists; (2) the matter common

<sup>a</sup> And, in one instance, viz. Mk. 4<sup>24</sup>, to the Discourse of Luke also (*cf.* Mt. 7<sup>2b</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>38b</sup>).

Here, and throughout the following pages, we refer to our First Gospel as 'Matthew,' without implying the Matthaean authorship.

to the First and Third Evangelists, but placed by the one Evangelist in the Sermon, and by the other in some other context; and (3) the matter recorded in the Sermon by the one Evangelist, but nowhere recorded by the other. In addition there is found, (4) matter which, as already mentioned, is paralleled in Mark, and (5) matter which is paralleled by the same Evangelist in another context of his Gospel.

Now the critical problems arising out of the phenomena pertaining to each one of these divisions are a part of the critical problems arising out of the phenomena of the Synoptic Gospels as a whole. We shall therefore precede our detailed consideration of the Sermon by an examination of those parts of the Synoptic Problem in general which especially bear upon our subject-matter.

In order that our consideration may be confined to those parts of the Problem which are more directly relevant to our subject, we are bound to make certain assumptions. We shall therefore take certain conclusions for granted: *e.g.* (*a*) that our Second Gospel is the earliest of the Synoptics, and that it was used by our First and by our Third Evangelist in a form differing but slightly at the most from that in which we now have it. Although the Sermon is a non-Marcan Discourse, this assumption is of the greatest importance in our investigation, for, building upon it, we shall constantly have to draw inferences from the known treatment by the First and Third Evangelists of their Marcan source as to the probable way in which they respectively treated their non-Marcan: (*b*) that neither Matthew nor Luke made use of the other's Gospel in the composition of his own. The help which the theory of the literary dependence of the one upon the other may afford towards accounting for some of the phenomena seems to be far outweighed by the difficulties which it introduces—difficulties from which any theory, whether oral or documentary, which seeks to account for the parallel non-Marcan matter of these two Gospels on the assumption of a community of sources alone, is free: (*c*) that our Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were both written, as we now have them, by St. Luke, the friend and companion of St. Paul.

## DOCUMENTARY SOURCES *VERSUS* ORAL 3

Bearing these assumptions in mind, we address ourselves to the first problem raised by the two reports of the Sermon. It is this: Are we to explain the non-Markan matter which is common to Matthew and Luke on an oral hypothesis or on a documentary? \*

1. When we consider the retentiveness of Eastern memories, and the prominence given to memory-training in Oriental education, the antecedent probability of oral transmission cannot fail to appear considerable. And in view of the remarkable divergences between some of the parallel sayings of Matthew and Luke, it seems natural to suppose that oral processes did in fact play a considerable part in the transmission of the narratives. Nevertheless, we are persuaded that, in a number of passages, the similarities are so great, and of such a nature, that it is far more probable to assume the existence of documentary material common to these Evangelists than to explain the resemblances as due solely to the fixity of form which an oral tradition might acquire. It is not only the fact of great verbal similarity which has to be accounted for, but also the inclusion in this similarity of rare words and uncommon expressions and constructions, for which more customary equivalents could readily have been found. To take but a few salient examples: in Mt. 10<sup>32</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>8</sup> there is a double occurrence of the remarkable expression *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν*, followed by a personal pronoun, which is without parallel in the N.T., and does not occur in the LXX.<sup>b</sup> In the report of the centurion's words in Mt. 8<sup>8</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>6-7</sup> we have the grammatical peculiarities *ικανὸς ἵνα* and *εἰπὲ λόγῳ*, which appear to be equally unique. In Mt. 11<sup>6</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>23</sup> there occurs the expression *σκανδαλίζεσθαι ἐν*, followed by a personal pronoun. Although not unique like *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν*, it occurs nowhere besides in Luke, in Mark only in the account of Christ's visit to Nazareth (6<sup>3</sup>), and elsewhere in Matthew only in his parallel to Mark's narrative (13<sup>57</sup>) and twice in the passage where Christ predicts that the Apostles will be offended, and Peter, taking up the words, avers that

\* Lists of this matter, arranged according to both the Lucan and the Matthaean order, will be found in Tables I A, B, and C appended to Chapter III.

<sup>b</sup> *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν* occurs in Rom. 10<sup>9</sup>, but in a different sense.



he will never be offended (26<sup>31, 33</sup>). These are all the N.T. occurrences. In the LXX, whilst the verb is followed by ἐν in three out of the four instances in which it occurs, and twice by ἐν with a pronoun, in each case the pronoun has an impersonal reference. In Mt. 11<sup>11</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>28</sup> we have ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν, which occurs nowhere else in the N.T., and in the LXX only five times in the Book of Job; in Mt. 11<sup>19</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>34</sup> φάγος, which is found only here in the N.T., and does not occur in the LXX; in Mt. 11<sup>22-24</sup> = Lk. 10<sup>12-15</sup> ἀνεκτός twice, which occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Mt. 10<sup>15</sup>, and not at all in the LXX; and in Mt. 11<sup>26</sup> = Lk. 10<sup>21</sup> ἐγένετο εὐδοκία, which is not found elsewhere in the N.T., or in the LXX. In the Sermon reports κάρφος and δοκός each occur three times in Mt. 7<sup>3-5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>41-2</sup>. Neither of these words is found elsewhere in the N.T. In the LXX κάρφος occurs but once, δοκός is found ten times. διαβλέπειν occurs in Mt. 7<sup>5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>42</sup>, and is found in the N.T. besides only in Mk. 8<sup>25</sup>, and not at all in the LXX. Once again, in the very close parallels Mt. 12<sup>41-42</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>31-32</sup> we have the expression μετανοεῖν εἰς, found here only in the N.T., and not at all in the LXX, as well as ἄνδρες Νινευεῖται, and πλεῖον in the sense of greater applied to a person, neither of which occurs elsewhere in the N.T. We notice also exact agreements in subtle points, as in the use of the verbs θεάσασθαι and ἰδεῖν in Mt. 11<sup>7-8</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>24-25</sup>, and of καί in Mt. 11<sup>9</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>26</sup>, where ἀμήν might have been expected. Similar agreements are found even in places where the construction of the sayings would seem highly conducive to variation, e.g. in the saying about God and mammon Mt. 6<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>13</sup>, where the stronger statement comes first, and the second conjunction ἢ appears to mean 'or at least'; and in the centurion's words to our Lord Mt. 8<sup>9</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>8</sup>, where the two opening clauses of the verse, the first of which expresses the centurion's own subjection to superior authority, and the second the subjection of soldiers to his own authority, are placed in juxtaposition without any conjunction. If, as might have been expected, the centurion had said that he was a man *in* authority, the next clause

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES *VERSUS* ORAL 5

introduced by ἔχων would have followed naturally, but both accounts agree in giving ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν.

Another fact to be noted is that where Matthew and Luke disagree as to order after a period of agreement, this divergence is not generally marked by inexactness of parallelism. If their source were oral, the dependence of memory upon connexion and sequence would lead us to expect this. *E.g.* Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup> is parallel to Lk. 11<sup>34-35</sup>, but the next verse in Matthew is placed by Luke in a totally different context, viz. 16<sup>13</sup>. Yet these two verses are identical, except that Luke has the word οἰκέτης, which is not represented in Matthew. Again, the section Mt. 11<sup>16-19</sup> is parallel to Lk. 7<sup>31-35</sup>, but the following section in Matthew, viz. 11<sup>20-24</sup>, occurs in Lk. 10<sup>12-15</sup>. Yet the parallelism in this latter section is decidedly close, and between the section which next follows in Matthew, viz. 11<sup>25-27</sup>, and Lk. 10<sup>21-22</sup>, which occurs in yet another context of Luke, it is almost perfect. Other instances of close resemblance where, on the oral hypothesis, divergence might have been expected, are Mt. 12<sup>43-45</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>24-26</sup> and Mt. 23<sup>37-39</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>34-35</sup>.<sup>a</sup>

The reluctance of some scholars to admit the documentary hypothesis seems to be partly due to a lingering notion of writing in the first century A.D. as a difficult art the knowledge of which was confined to a few specialists. Recent discoveries have made it clear that such was not the case. The Egyptian papyri prove that writing was prevalent in the Graeco-Roman world even long before the Christian era.<sup>b</sup> With regard to the second generation of Christians, we have the testimony of St. Luke in the Preface of his Gospel. He states that, before he himself wrote, many had 'taken in hand to draw up a narrative' of the Christian facts, as these had been delivered to them by the 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word' of the first generation. And, with regard to the first generation of Christians, the improbability appears to be, not that

<sup>a</sup> Although we have drawn these comparisons from the standpoint of the Matthaean order, we do not mean to imply that it is preferable to the Lucan.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches*, c. 1; and Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*, p. 21.

## 6 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

Christian writings should have been produced, but rather that no Christian pen should have recorded any of the sayings and doings of our Lord.

2. It may be objected, however, that we have laid exclusive stress on those passages in which the parallelism is most exact. We have indeed given prior consideration to these passages, because they seem to lead to a definite conclusion in regard to *them*, viz. that they are based on common documentary matter. And this conclusion carries with it the probability that Matthew and Luke are also using documentary matter where the parallelism between them is less exact. It is not reasonable to suppose that they always adhered to their documents with verbal exactitude. Many causes may have co-operated to induce looseness of reproduction. (a) In the first place, the age in which they lived did not set upon exactness of reproduction the value which we recognise. And they were not mere copyists, but evangelists, conscious of the dignity of their office. They would feel themselves at liberty to make such use as they saw fit of their documents and to take account of such oral traditions as were accessible to them. Much of our Lord's teaching was heard by many people, who would report it in forms differing slightly from one another, thus giving rise to many strains of tradition, with a considerable tendency to variation. (b) Secondly, they may have been familiar as preachers and catechists with much of what they record. In Philemon v. 24 St. Paul speaks of Luke as one of his fellow-workers. We may infer that he was a preacher of Christianity, and perhaps also a catechist. In our First Gospel there is much which suggests that its compiler was a catechist. If then our Evangelists were familiar with the matter contained in their sources that familiarity may well have made it hard for them to follow their wording with slavish literalness. It is interesting to notice, in this connexion, that, as Sir John Hawkins has pointed out, the more fundamental parts of Christian teaching are often recorded with less than the average of verbal agreement.<sup>a</sup> (c) Besides, the Evangelists were probably beset by physical difficulties in repro-

<sup>a</sup> *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 100, 121.

ducing their sources with exactitude—difficulties which can only be duly appreciated by a consideration of the external conditions under which they wrote. Some of the phenomena which simulate oral transmission may be in reality due to an interval having elapsed between their reading of a paragraph of their text and their writing down its contents.<sup>a</sup> (d) It is possible too that they were pressed for space. At least it is remarkable that, whilst the length of papyrus roll, in the case of Greek books, rarely if ever exceeded thirty feet, it is estimated that our Matthew would require about that number, and our Luke about thirty-one feet, assuming the roll to be of average height.<sup>b</sup> No doubt more matter could have been included in the roll if the Evangelists had written in a smaller hand than was customary, and there are exceptional instances of a roll being written upon at the back as well as the front. But, if we may assume that they contemplated copies being made of their manuscripts, it is not probable that they would so write as to place difficulties in the way of copyists, or to involve them in unusual procedures. If then we may assume that Matthew and Luke were both anxious to compress their matter within the compass of a single papyrus roll of ordinary length, this desire may have led them, not only to omit matter contained in their sources, but also to reproduce it freely rather than verbally. It would naturally impel them to try to express the substance of it in a shorter space, wherever it seemed to them possible to do so. (e) Then, again, the Evangelists themselves were probably men of very different types. St. Luke was a Gentile physician, who had travelled much in companionship with St. Paul, and was familiar with the Graeco-Roman world. We naturally think of our First Gospel as from the hand of a Jew whose home was in or near Palestine. And it was for different races of Christians that they wrote. St. Matthew is as characteristically the Gospel for Jewish converts as St. Luke is that for Gentile.

But we are not limited to considerations of this nature. We have the analogy of the treatment by the Evangelists

<sup>a</sup> See Sanday, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 16 ff.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*, pp. 19, 30.



of the matter which they derive from Mark, and it is most instructive. Here too the parallelism between Matthew and Luke varies greatly in closeness. And by comparing Matthew and Luke with Mark we can see how the divergences arise from the alterations which each of them has made in Mark's text. Sometimes they follow it closely, at other times with moderate fidelity, and sometimes quite loosely. In some instances the differences between Matthew and Luke are so great that, if Mark had been lost, they might seem to be following independent traditions rather than to be independently modifying the same document. The comparison with Mark is also instructive as showing that the difference from each other of Matthew and Luke often exceeds considerably the departure of each from Mark.

3. Accepting then the hypothesis that, speaking generally, the parallel non-Markan matter of our Evangelists lay before them both in a documentary form, we have to ask whether this matter was contained in a single document, or in several; and also whether, if in a single document, it was the same or different forms of it which they used.

In regard to both these questions, as with not a few others raised by the Synoptic Problem, an absolutely sure conclusion is probably not attainable from the evidence at our disposal. We must be content therefore if we can establish a balance of probability. In general it may be said that the simpler hypothesis, provided it meets the facts, is preferable to the more complex. Biblical criticism has suffered, especially at the hands of German scholars, from a tendency to multiply entities beyond what is necessary. The Ur-Markus theories are a case in point, and their discredit with the best scholars of to-day should be a warning against adopting any theory in the other great branch of the Synoptic Problem which is more complicated than the facts require. On the other hand, we must not allow our desire for a simple and inclusive hypothesis to close our eyes to facts which do not suit it.

(a) As to the unity of the source, the very great divergence of order between Matthew and Luke, and the seemingly disconnected nature of much of its contents, may

seem to argue its derivation from a number of more or less scrappy sources rather than from a single continuous one. But we hope to show in the next chapter that a satisfactory explanation can be given of the differences of order on the assumption that a single document lay before the Evangelists. If this document consisted almost exclusively of notable sayings of Christ, its contents might well be of a disconnected character. Moreover, it is less probable that the Evangelists would use in common a number of separate documents than that they would both use one of considerable extent, especially if it was a document of high reputation. The more important the source, and the higher its estimation in the early Church, the greater is the likelihood of its having been independently used by both Matthew and Luke. Then too it is probable that a number of independent records would overlap each other. And if our Evangelists were using several overlapping sources, it is not unlikely that they would repeat some sayings three or even more times, for they betray by a number of doublets their use of at least one source besides Mark. But the only triplet found in Matthew and Luke is the short saying 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,' which occurs three times in Matthew (viz. 11<sup>15</sup>, 13<sup>9</sup>, 43). Again, whilst it may not be possible to find any characteristic expressions running through the whole of this non-Markan matter,<sup>a</sup> it yet seems to have a certain unity of style and subject-matter,<sup>b</sup> and behind all the divergences of order there can be discovered a certain original unity of arrangement.<sup>c</sup> It seems *a priori* reasonable that a collection of sayings and discourses of Christ should have been drawn up in the first age of the Church, and there is a probability, which to many minds is considerable, that this is the document to which Papias refers as having been composed by the Apostle Matthew. If we accept this identification, we are able to give a reasonable explanation of the fact that our First Gospel is attributed to the Apostle Matthew, and we also gain confirmation of the view that the common non-Markan

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Hawkins, *Horae Synopt.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 113.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 162 f.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Streeter, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 143 ff.

material of our Evangelists derives from a single source, at least in the main.

It may be objected, however, that Luke's Preface to his Gospel contains no hint of such a document. Instead, he speaks of many Christian narratives. But neither is there any hint of the existence, among these narratives, of Mark's Gospel. Yet we know from the internal evidence of the Gospel that Luke made very considerable use of that one source. The fact that, in the case of Mark, Matthew and Luke have substantially incorporated matter drawn from a single document of considerable length, lends probability to the hypothesis that they have acted similarly in regard to their non-Markan matter. We need not question Luke's statement that there were many narratives in existence, yet there is ground for thinking that at least a considerable part of the matter peculiar to him derives from another single source, of considerable extent.<sup>a</sup> In fact, so far as internal evidence shows, Matthew and Luke had no predisposition in favour of short and fragmentary sources. They seem rather to have preferred to incorporate matter from the most comprehensive Christian documents to which they had access.

It may be thought, however, that the fact that the supposed non-Markan document has perished without leaving any trace of itself outside the Gospels is ground for scepticism as to its ever having existed. Matter of such outstanding importance might be expected to have been many times copied, and highly treasured, by each generation of Christians. But here too the comparison with Mark is instructive. It is practically certain that the last twelve verses of our Mark are not the original ending of the Gospel, but that they have been added by a later hand. And it is highly improbable that the original Mark ended abruptly with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ of 16<sup>9</sup>. The most natural explanation of this sudden close is that all our manuscripts are derived from a single papyrus roll, the concluding lines of which had either perished or become illegible. If so, the survival of our Second Gospel once depended upon a single manuscript, and that a defective

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Bartlet, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 329 ff.

one. Even in later ages, we know that Mark was not highly prized in comparison with the longer Gospels, and it is not until quite modern times that the researches of N.T. scholars have revealed the great historical value of its vivid and graphic record. Besides Mark, not one of the Gospels of which St. Luke speaks has survived. The tendency in those early days would probably be to forget, and to allow to perish, records which were regarded as having been superseded by fuller narratives.

We conclude therefore that, speaking generally, the non-Markan matter common to Matthew and Luke derives from a single documentary source, and we shall in future refer to it under the customary symbol Q.

(b) As to whether it was the same form of this document, or different versions or recensions of it, which Matthew and Luke used, there seems to be more room for doubt. Some of the closer parallels seem to indicate that the Evangelists are neither themselves making independent translations even of the same original, nor using such translations made by others; but that they are both using either the same or very similar Greek versions of this matter. It is true that some differences can be accounted for as translation variants. But it does not follow that this is the true explanation of them. The instances adduced by Wellhausen and others do not seem to be convincing as evidence of independent translations of a common Aramaic source.\* A large proportion of the differences can be naturally explained as due to alterations of a common Greek source made by the Evangelists themselves. There are however other passages where the differences are such as cannot so readily be thus explained. They seem rather to imply different sources, or different versions or recensions of the same source. These passages however are few in number, and with regard to the bulk of the matter the theory of different recensions does not seem necessary to explain the facts.

Here too the analogy of Mark is helpful. The agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark point to their having used in common not only a recension of the Marcan

\* Cf. Allen, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 299 ff.



text somewhat different from that which is the archetype of all our extant manuscripts, but also, in a number of cases, another version of the facts than the Marcan. The same may be the case with their use of Q. In general they may have used copies of Q as closely similar as their copies of Mark. If we accept the tradition that Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome, and if we regard Matthew as having originated in Palestine or Syria, it would appear no more difficult to suppose the same or similar manuscript copies to have fallen into their hands in the case of Q than in that of Mark. We know that Luke visited Palestine; we do not know, and may hold it doubtful, that the compiler of Matthew visited Rome. But it is possible that our Evangelists had access to other recensions or versions of Q than that which they used in common, and also to other sources besides Q for some of the matter which Q records, and that they sometimes showed a preference for the accounts contained in these sources.

## CHAPTER II

## THE PROBABLE ORDER OF Q

ASSUMING that Matthew and Luke drew at least the bulk of their common non-Markan matter from a document Q in the same or in a similar Greek form, we proceed to inquire into its original order.

A glance at the lists of this matter appended to Chapter III (Tables I A, B, C) shows that Matthew and Luke agree to a certain extent as to order, and disagree to a large extent. Where they agree it is natural to suppose that we have the original order of Q. And the analogy of their treatment of Mark supports this, for there is no instance where they agree in order against Mark. With regard to their divergences, we have to ask whether one of them, and if so which one, may reasonably be thought to have preserved the original order. We cannot do better than begin by examining the manner in which they have respectively dealt with Mark.

1. (a) Matthew generally preserves the order of Mark's sections, but he alters it a good deal in cc. 8-10 and 12-13.<sup>a</sup> While, as we shall see shortly, there is reason to suppose that he is here influenced by a source other than Mark for some of the matter which is parallel to him, his transpositions of Mark's sections seem clearly to be due to his desire to place together similar subject-matter. In cc. 8-9 he has brought together ten miracles, illustrating Christ's power in ten different aspects. C. 10 is similarly homogeneous, consisting of a long discourse to the Twelve.

<sup>a</sup> This is clearly set forth in the table in Allen's *St. Matthew*, Introd., p. 14.

In c. 12, or perhaps rather from 11<sup>20</sup>, his purpose seems to have been to give instances of that growing hostility on the part of the Scribes and Pharisees which led our Lord to adopt the method of teaching by parables. These instances culminate in the Beelzebub Discourse of 12<sup>25-37</sup>, and in that following the request for a sign, 12<sup>38-45</sup>. Then in c. 13 we have a collection of seven parables. Similar topical grouping of material in cc. 5-7, 18, and 23-25 seems to be indicated by the recurrence in 7<sup>28a</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup> and 26<sup>1</sup> of the resumptive saying which immediately follows cc. 8-10 in 11<sup>1</sup> and the Parables of c. 13 in 13<sup>53</sup>.

(b) A comparison of Luke with Mark shows that he has with very few exceptions preserved the order of Mark's sections. Of large transpositions of Marcan matter to a wholly different context we can find but six cases,<sup>a</sup> and in all of these his deviation from Mark's order may be due to his following that of Q. We will consider these instances individually.

(1) Mark's sections 3<sup>7-12</sup> and 3<sup>13-19</sup> relate respectively Christ's withdrawal to the Lake of Galilee and wonderful works, and His Call of the Twelve. Luke transposes Mark's order, relating the Call of the Twelve in 6<sup>12-16</sup> and Christ's wonderful works on a level place in 6<sup>17-19</sup>. Perhaps the coming insertion of the Sermon here accounts for the transposition. We may suppose that Luke wanted a suitable introduction to the Discourse, and therefore placed the matter of Mk. 3<sup>7-12</sup> immediately before it. But it seems probable that Q would contain some introduction to the Sermon, and if so Luke's order may be due to his following of Q in preference to Mark.<sup>b</sup>

(2) Luke seems to have transposed the Beelzebub Discourse of Mk. 3<sup>22-30</sup> to his Great Interpolation, 11<sup>14-26</sup>. But Matthew and Luke have so much in common in addition to Mark, besides verbal agreements against Mark, in this narrative that it seems necessary to assume that they had access to another version of this Discourse than the Marcan.<sup>c</sup> Their common divergences from Mark are too

<sup>a</sup> We have not included Lk. 10<sup>45-28</sup>, because of its differences from Mk. 12<sup>28-31</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> See further on this in Chapter IV.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Streeter, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 169 ff.

great to be accounted for by differences between their text of Mark and that which has come down to us. Careful comparison of the three Synoptic accounts makes it appear probable that Luke has drawn his narrative entirely from Q, whilst Matthew has conflated the two versions.

(3) Luke places the incident of the coming of Christ's mother and brethren in 8<sup>19-21</sup>, after the detached sayings following the Parable of the Sower and its explanation. Mark relates this incident in 3<sup>31-35</sup>, immediately after the Beelzebub Discourse. It is remarkable that Luke records after the Beelzebub Discourse a section, 11<sup>27-28</sup>, which presents much similarity to the Marcan and which may have followed that discourse in Q. If it did so, and in view of his omission of the Beelzebub Discourse in the Marcan context, the transposition of this incident may have seemed to him justifiable, or even necessary.

(4) The Parable of the Mustard Seed, which Mark records in 4<sup>30-32</sup>, occurs in Lk. 13<sup>18-19</sup>. Here Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in appending the Parable of the Leaven, and in several points of detail. It seems probable that here, as in the Beelzebub Discourse, Q had matter parallel to Mark, and that Luke is drawing from Q and not from Mark.<sup>a</sup>

(5) Luke places in 17<sup>31</sup> the sayings, 'Let him that is on the housetop not come down; let him that is in the field not turn back.' Mark records these sayings in the Eschatological Discourse, 13<sup>15-16</sup>. Here again it seems probable that Luke is drawing from Q. There is Q matter both before and after this verse in the same discourse (Lk. 17<sup>22-37</sup>), and Luke's parallel to Mark is not so close as that of Mt. 24<sup>17-18</sup>. It may well be that, as Streeter thinks,<sup>b</sup> Lk. 17<sup>22-37</sup> is a solid block of Q.

(6) The last instance is from Luke's Passion narrative. He places in 22<sup>24-27</sup>, after the Institution of the Eucharist, the counsels to humility which Mark records in 10<sup>41-45</sup>. Here, once more, derivation from Q may be the true explanation. Luke's version is strikingly different from

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Streeter, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 172-173.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 201.



Mark's, and he entirely omits our Lord's saying that He came to give His life a ransom for many.<sup>a</sup>

2. It is probable that Matthew and Luke have dealt with Q's order as they have dealt with Mark's. There is much in their Gospels which strengthens this probability.

(a) Matthew draws from Q as well as from Mark in the compilation of his compendia on related topics. In cc. 8-9 he draws from Q, not only for the healing of the centurion's servant (which probably followed immediately upon the Sermon in Q), but probably also for the healing of the dumb man possessed with a devil, which he seems to have taken from Q's introduction to the Beelzebub Discourse (*cf.* 12<sup>22-24</sup>, with which 9<sup>32-34</sup> constitutes a pair of doublets). In c. 10 he combines Mark's Mission Charge with that of Lk. 10, and embodies much other Q matter in the same discourse. In 10<sup>17-22</sup> he seems even to have drawn from Mk. 13<sup>9-13</sup>, and to have placed it in the midst of Q matter.<sup>b</sup> In c. 13 he draws from Q as well as from Mark in his collection of parables. In c. 18 he has combined within the same discourse matter drawn from Q with matter drawn from Mark; and similarly in cc. 23-25 he has much Q matter combined with Marcan. Mt. 5-7 is the only one of Matthew's five great blocks of related matter in which there is not clear evidence of Q matter being placed side by side with Marcan.<sup>c</sup> Thus Matthew draws upon Q as well as upon Mark for the materials which he incorporates into his compendia on related topics, and he has doubtless rearranged his Q material as he has done his Marcan in order to fit it into his scheme.

(b) Luke's general procedure, on the other hand, is to follow Mark alone for a considerable period, retaining the order of his sections, and then to lay him aside for a considerable period. The great bulk of his Q matter is con-

<sup>a</sup> Streeter's contention (*Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 146, note) that Luke is obliged to displace this saying because he has omitted the incident to which Mark attaches it does not seem valid. If he drew it from Mark, there seems no reason why he should not have inserted it after Lk. 18<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> It is, however, possible that Q contained matter parallel to these verses of Mark, and that Matthew here drew from Q and not from Mark.

<sup>c</sup> The question of whether Mt. 5-7 contains any matter drawn from Mark will be discussed in Chapter V.

tained in his two large interpolations into the Marcan framework, viz. 6<sup>20</sup>–8<sup>3</sup> and 9<sup>51</sup>–18<sup>14</sup>. He makes no use of Mark in the former, and there is good reason for thinking that he makes very little if any direct use of him also in the whole of the latter.<sup>a</sup> Probably then, when Luke uses Q, he deals with Q as he deals with Mark, *i.e.* he follows it alone for a considerable period, retaining the order of its contents. An examination of Luke's two interpolations confirms this supposition. Both appear to begin with a long extract from Q, followed perhaps by matter from another source or sources.<sup>b</sup> Probably then the other part of the supposition is also correct—viz. that Luke retains the order of Q's contents.

(c) Another argument in favour of the Lucan order is that there seems to be no trace of his having rearranged his Q material. He appears to have inserted his two interpolations into the Marcan framework at points suggested by the first Q sections which he records—*i.e.* the Great Sermon, with perhaps its Q introduction, in the case of the lesser interpolation, and, probably, the incident of the inhospitable Samaritans in the case of the greater. Having begun to follow Q, he seems to have continued to do so for considerable periods, without presuming to alter its order. No plan is apparent according to which Luke may have arranged his Q matter. We do not trace numerical arrangements, such as are characteristic of Matthew. As he records it, Q consists largely of apophthegms, loosely strung together. That this is how the matter actually stood in Q is supported by the analogy of the contents of the *Pirké Aboth* and of the *Oxyrhynchus Logoi*. If we suppose Luke's order to be original, it is easy to understand the bringing together by Matthew of this material into great discourses. But if we follow Harnack in thinking Matthew's order to be original,<sup>c</sup> it seems impossible to give any intelligible account of Luke's scattering and rearrangement of the matter: how, *e.g.*, on this hypothesis, can we account for the extraordinary

<sup>a</sup> This is admirably argued by Sir John Hawkins in *Studies in the Syn. Problem*,

pp. 29–59.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Streeter, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 189 ff.

<sup>c</sup> *Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 172–182.

juxtapositions in Lk. 12 of matter drawn from very different parts of Q? Moreover, if Matthew's order is original, many of Luke's introductions to Q sayings must be his own composition, and, in so far as they do not harmonise with Matthew's placing, devoid of historical value. It is not easy to believe that Luke is responsible for inventions such as it becomes necessary to assume some of his introductions to be.<sup>a</sup>

We conclude that Luke's order is preferable to Matthew's, and that, speaking generally, there is reason for believing Luke's order to be the original order of Q.

3. Besides their large divergences in the order of their Q matter, Matthew and Luke often differ in the order of what they both include within the limits of the same section:—e.g. in the case of the second and third temptations, and of the sayings about the Men of Nineveh and the Queen of the South.<sup>b</sup> It is natural to suppose that, as Luke seems to be faithful to Q's order in general, he is probably also faithful to it in detail. But it does not necessarily follow that this is the case. Our best plan will be to see whether this view is borne out by the way in which Matthew and Luke have dealt respectively with the detailed order of what they have drawn from Mark.

(a) Hawkins, 'Horae Syn.<sup>2</sup>,' pp. 78–79, mentions five instances in which Matthew has transposed Marcan material. They are as follows:

- (1) Mk. 7<sup>6–13</sup>; Mt. 15<sup>3–9</sup>: the quotation from Is. 29<sup>13</sup>, and the reference to Corban.
- (2) Mk. 9<sup>12–13</sup>; Mt. 17<sup>12</sup>: the rejection of the Son of Man and of 'Elijah.'
- (3) Mk. 10<sup>3–9</sup>; Mt. 19<sup>4–8</sup>: the references to the permission of divorce by Moses and to Gen. 1<sup>27</sup>.
- (4) In Mt. 8<sup>26</sup> the disciples are rebuked for want of faith *before*, in Mk. 4<sup>39, 40</sup>; Lk. 8<sup>24, 25</sup> *after*, the stilling of the storm.

<sup>a</sup> See Hawkins, *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 123–124.

<sup>b</sup> See the list in *Horae Syn.<sup>2</sup>*, pp. 78, 79.

- (5) In Mt. 13<sup>12</sup> 'Whosoever hath, to him,' etc., is placed *before*, in Mk. 4<sup>25</sup> and Lk. 8<sup>18</sup> it is placed *after*, the explanation of the Parable of the Sower.

These instances are all, with the exception of the fourth, transpositions of sayings within discourse matter.

(b) In considering Luke's treatment of Mark's order, we must distinguish between his Ministry- and his Passion-narrative.

In the latter there are no less than twelve transpositions, a list of which is given by Hawkins in 'Studies in the Syn. Problem,' pp. 81-83. But in the whole of the Passion-narrative Luke appears to be drawing from another source besides Mark. His frequent transpositions of Mark's order are but one out of many evidences of his general looseness of adherence to his Marcan source. Also, the transpositions occur for the most part in narrative matter, and not in discourse.

In the Ministry-narrative we only find the following transpositions of Marcan matter :

- (1) Mk. 4<sup>37-38</sup> ; Lk. 8<sup>23</sup> : the storm on the Lake and Christ sleeping.
- (2) Mk. 5<sup>3-8</sup> ; Lk. 8<sup>28-29</sup> : the Gadarene demoniac's frequent bursting of chains and fetters and his cry, 'What have I to do with thee,' etc.
- (3) In Mk. 5<sup>22-43</sup>, Lk. 8<sup>41-56</sup>, Mark mentions that Jairus' daughter was twelve years old at the end of the account, Luke at the beginning; Mark mentions Christ's command that something should be given her to eat after relating the amazement of the parents and Christ's charge of secrecy; Luke places first the command that something should be given her to eat.
- (4) In Mk. 6<sup>44</sup>, Lk. 9<sup>14a</sup>, Mark gives the number 5000 *after*, Luke *before*, the account of the feeding.
- (5) In Mk. 12<sup>8</sup>, Lk. 20<sup>15</sup>, Mark reads 'They killed him, and cast him out,' Luke reads 'They cast him out and killed him.'



These are but trifling alterations, and all but the last are alterations in the order of narrative, not of discourse.

Thus, the treatment of Mark's order by Matthew and Luke goes to show that Matthew cannot be trusted to preserve the detailed order of Q. It perhaps supports the view that more reliance is to be placed upon Luke's order. But it must be remembered that Luke has less Marcan matter than Matthew, and considerably less of Mark's discourse matter.

An examination of the Q passages which are recorded with divergences of order does not seem to carry us much further. There are some where Luke's order looks more original than Matthew's: *e.g.* it is hard to think that, if the Matthaean order of the second and third temptations is original, Luke would have altered it. Matthew's arrangement is so dramatically effective that a literary artist like Luke would hardly have spoilt it. But, in some other passages, there seems to be no internal evidence that Luke has preserved the original order of Q:—*e.g.* the saying about the moth and the thief in Mt. 6<sup>20</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>33</sup>.

## CHAPTER III

## THE PROBABLE EXTENT AND WORDING OF Q

## I. THE PROBABLE EXTENT OF Q.

WE concluded in the first chapter that at least the bulk of the non-Marcan matter common to Matthew and Luke is probably derived from Q. We now proceed to ask, How much Synoptic matter besides this may reasonably be supposed to be drawn from the same source? When we have eliminated from Matthew and Luke the non-Marcan matter common to them, the remainder divides into two classes. There is, first, the non-Marcan matter peculiar to the one or the other of them; and, secondly, the Marcan matter which both or either of them record. What we have, then, to consider is, How far is it reasonable to assign to Q the matter which falls into each of these classes?

1. The non-Marcan matter of the single tradition of Matthew and Luke.

(a) Comparing Mark with Matthew and Luke, we find that about two-thirds of Mark are paralleled by both Evangelists; also that Matthew has parallels to about eleven-twelfths, and Luke to slightly over three-fourths. If, then, Matthew and Luke have incorporated Q to the same respective degrees as they appear to have incorporated Mark, they will have reproduced in common about two-thirds of the original Q; the matter peculiar to Matthew will include a little less than one-fourth of the whole of Q, and that peculiar to Luke about one-twelfth.<sup>a</sup>

(b) But how far is it reasonable to suppose that our Evangelists have treated their Q source in the same way as their Marcan? Matthew shows a preference for the sayings of Christ. He takes a very early opportunity

<sup>a</sup> It should be borne in mind, however, that not all the Gospel parallels to Mark are necessarily drawn from Mark. This consideration is of special importance in reference to the Marcan parallels of Luke.

of inserting the Sermon on the Mount into the Marcan framework. The fact that the first of his great compendia consists entirely of discourse, and that it takes precedence of any of the miracles in his record (save for the reference to works of healing in the summary account of the early Ministry in 4<sup>23-25</sup>), is significant. Moreover, Matthew shortens Mark's narrative while he extends his discourse.<sup>a</sup> This preference for discourse on Matthew's part points to his having incorporated an even larger proportion of Q than of Mark. It seems very possible that, as Canon Allen thinks,<sup>b</sup> the great bulk of Matthew's non-Markan matter comes from a single source. If we accept the identification of Q with the *Logia* of Matthew mentioned by Papias, it is easier to understand the ascription to Matthew of the whole of our First Gospel if it derives from Q a good deal of the matter peculiar to itself, besides that which it shares with Luke. Sir John Hawkins estimates the latter as containing not more than 236 verses or parts of verses.<sup>c</sup> This is considerably less than a quarter of the 1068 verses contained in the whole Gospel. But, if we include in Q the bulk of the discourse matter peculiar to Matthew (amounting to about 200 verses), we increase the Q element to about two-thirds as much again.

There is, however, one consideration which may have led Matthew to omit some of the Q matter which he would otherwise have incorporated. This consideration is the disconnected nature which, as appears from Luke's Gospel, seems to have pertained to much of the contents of Q. Matthew shows no fondness for isolated utterances. He has compiled where he could; where he could not find a suitable place for his Q matter in any of his blocks of discourse, it is not improbable that he has omitted.

With regard to Luke, the several instances where he seems to follow Q's version in place of the parallel account in Mark may indicate a general preference for Q. If so, he may have omitted less of Q than of Mark. On the other hand, his disuse of Mark includes that of discourse matter such as Q records—e.g. Mk. 4<sup>26-29</sup>, 7<sup>1-23</sup>, 9<sup>41-1012</sup>. And

<sup>a</sup> This is exhibited by the figures of Tables IIA, IIB, IIC, IID at the end of this chapter.

<sup>b</sup> See *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 235 ff.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* p. 111.

he may well have omitted some of Q's matter because he did not think it relevant or intelligible to his Gentile readers.

(c) What other considerations throw light upon the question? If the non-Marcan matter common to Matthew and Luke exhibited strongly-marked characteristics of words and expressions, these might be applied as a test of identity of source origin to the rest of the Synoptic matter. But a close examination of the Q matter fails to disclose any such characteristics. There are, however, certain general characteristics pertaining to it. These are admirably set forth by Sir John Hawkins in 'Studies in the Synoptic Problem,' pp. 125-129. So far as it is permissible to argue from the part to the whole, these characteristics do constitute a criterion as to source origin. They show, *e.g.*, that it is not probable that Q contained any considerable narratives, nor the Old Testament quotations characteristic of Matthew, nor any of the longer parables. In estimating the probabilities in particular instances, there are various considerations which may often be profitably taken into account—*e.g.* the Evangelist who omits may betray knowledge of what the other records. An instance of this seems to occur in Lk. 6<sup>27</sup>, as will appear in a later chapter (see pp. 80, 81). Then, in Matthew's discourses, if a saying peculiar to him has no appearance of having suggested itself for insertion from elsewhere, this is a reason for thinking that he records it where he found it in his source. Luke's habit of following a single source for a considerable space makes it appear probable that matter in his single tradition which is preceded and followed by matter which he shares with Matthew is drawn from Q. This is especially the case if the whole passage of which the peculiar matter forms a part seems to be a homogeneous unity—*e.g.* Lk. 17<sup>22-37</sup>. Then, again, if it appears reasonable to suppose that, had a particular passage occurred in Q, the one or the other Evangelist would have omitted it, this is in favour of the inclusion of the passage in Q. Conversely, if there is ground for thinking that, had the Evangelist who omits a passage known of it, he would have included it, this is in favour of exclusion; *e.g.* we may argue that, had Luke



known the story of the Visit of the Magi, of Mt. 2, he would probably have recorded it, because it accords well with the spirit and the destination of his Gospel; and, therefore, that probably this narrative was not included in Q.

## 2. The Marcan matter of Matthew and Luke.

There are very strong reasons for thinking that some of this matter stood in Q. For, (*a*) in a number of passages of the Triple Tradition, Matthew and Luke have considerable agreements against Mark. These agreements are not such as can always be explained by supposing that our First and Third Evangelists are following a different recension of Mark's text from that which has descended to us. They are too considerable for this, and can only be accounted for by postulating a common source other than the Marcan; *cf.*, *e.g.*, the detailed accounts in Matthew and Luke of the Baptist's preaching and the Temptation with the brief statements in Mark. Sometimes Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, not only in verbal differences, but also in placing the passage or saying in a non-Markan context; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Mk. 9<sup>50</sup> (the saying about the savourless salt) with Mt. 5<sup>13</sup> and Lk. 14<sup>34</sup>.

(*b*) Another sign of a duplicity of sources is the occurrence of doublets. We must not overstate the argument from them. A doublet is not always an indication that the Evangelist has drawn the repeated saying from two different sources. He may have repeated it twice from the same source. There are several instances in Matthew where this seems to be the true explanation. But in a number of cases the Gospel doublets are accompanied by other indications which point strongly to the two members having been drawn from different sources.

In a number of the Marcan passages of Matthew and Luke which seem to derive from a source other than Mark, the closeness of the agreement of Matthew and Luke and the nature of the subject-matter favour strongly derivation from Q. How much more of the Marcan matter of Matthew and Luke may reasonably be assigned to the same source? This is impossible to ascertain with any precision. But in general it may be said that wherever either Matthew or Luke gives a Marcan passage with considerable

differences from Mark, this affords some presumption that it is drawn from a non-Marcian source. And Q may also have contained some Marcan matter, of a non-Marcian origin of which a comparison of the Gospels affords no indication ; *e.g.* it may have contained a version of the anti-Pharisaic discourse of Mk. 7<sup>1-23</sup>, although there is no evidence of its having done so, as the discourse is paralleled by Matthew alone, who places it in the Marcan context and appears to be drawing upon Mark alone. But, on the other hand, all we know of Q leads us to think that whatever Marcan matter it may have comprised consisted almost wholly of discourse.

There is one thing more which it seems worth while to say. It is this. Matthew and Luke between them have probably preserved almost the whole of Q. The analogy of Mark is in favour of this. It is also much easier, on this supposition, to understand how Q came to perish utterly, leaving no trace either of the original or of any translation.

## II. THE PROBABLE WORDING OF Q.

It remains for us to consider how far the versions of Q matter contained in Matthew and Luke may be deemed faithful to its wording.

1. Here, once more, it is helpful to examine the treatment by the Evangelists of the matter which they have drawn from Mark. As to this, we have compiled some statistics, which are set out in Tables IIA, IIB, IIC, IID, appended to this chapter.

Before examining the figures, a few words of explanation will be desirable. The lists do not include Marcan passages which seem to have been paralleled in Q, their object being to exhibit the parallels to Mark, where Mark seems to have been the sole documentary source.<sup>a</sup>

Words which are reproduced with difference of grammatical inflexion only are computed as if the whole word

<sup>a</sup> Some of the substantial additions of Matthew and Luke noted in the lists may, however, derive from documentary material.

was reproduced. In the case of other differences, a part only of the word is reckoned as being reproduced. This part is generally a half, but where there are three divisions of the word it is sometimes computed as a third. The text of Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* has generally been followed. In a few cases of doubtful inclusions the suspected words have been enclosed within curved brackets. The words so enclosed have been included in the totals.

The statistics set out in these lists are valuable in many directions. Here we can only briefly notice some of the more important.

(a) First, there is the broad fact that the Marcan passages to which we have given Matthaean parallels are considerably more numerous than those to which we have given Lucan. Our figures give Matthew a percentage of nearly 29·7 in excess of Luke for narrative and discourse together, and of a little over 29·9 for discourse only. Thus, if the extent to which Matthew and Luke have respectively used Q corresponds with that to which, according to our lists, they have used Mark, Matthew will have incorporated about three-tenths more of Q than Luke.<sup>a</sup>

(b) Secondly, the figures show how great are the departures in some particular instances from the average treatment of Mark by Matthew and Luke :—e.g. Matthew's parallels to Mk. 4<sup>10-12</sup> and 10<sup>23-31</sup> each contain nearly twice Mark's number of words, whilst his parallels to Mk. 9<sup>14-29</sup> and 5<sup>21-43</sup> each contain less than half. The natural inference is that Q may have been treated by our First and Third Evangelists with similar freedom and variation.

(c) Thirdly, the lists show that the gross totals do not give the nearest analogy to the probable treatment of Q matter, but that to reach this (i) we must leave out narrative. They show that both Matthew and Luke have a higher regard for discourse than for narrative. Their reports of discourse are fuller ; the percentages of Mark's wording which they reproduce, both in common and also individually, are higher ; and their substantial omissions are fewer. Matthew further shows his preference for

<sup>a</sup> This is a rather larger percentage than the difference between the fractions given on p. 21.

discourse by inserting into it a far larger proportion of substantial additions, as well as in other ways.

(ii) We must also omit the Passion matter. Comparison shows a clear differentiation of treatment, in respect of both narrative and discourse, between the Passion matter and the rest of Mark. It is more pronounced in Luke than in Matthew. It is also of a different kind. Whilst Matthew differentiates by the unusual fullness of his parallels to Mark's Passion matter, by reproducing a larger proportion of Mark's words, and by having a smaller proportion of substantial additions and a very much smaller proportion of substantial omissions; Luke differentiates by the unusual brevity of his parallels, by reproducing a considerably smaller proportion of Mark's words, and by having a very much larger proportion of substantial additions, and a considerably larger proportion of substantial omissions. These differences result in the proportion, alike of Marcan words reproduced by both Matthew and Luke, and also of words reproduced by neither Matthew nor Luke, being considerably lower in the Passion matter than elsewhere.

(iii) We shall also be wise in omitting the Eschatological Discourse of Mk. 13. This is the only discourse of Mark which, for length and continuity, is comparable to some of the major discourses of the other Synoptists. It might be surmised therefore that the treatment of it by Matthew and Luke would approach nearer than that of any other Marcan matter to their probable treatment of Q. The considerable differences which comparison of it with that of the rest of Mark's non-Passion matter reveals might be explained as due to the fact that the latter consists largely of short and broken bits of discourse. But if we take three or four of the longest pieces of discourse in Mk. 1-12 and compare the figures for them with those for the whole of Mk. 1-12 on the one hand, and with those for Mk. 13 on the other, we find that the differences of treatment between the former are slight in comparison with those between the latter. Moreover, the departures in the treatment of Mk. 13 from that of Mk. 1-12 are, to a large extent, either in the direction of that of the Passion matter, or even beyond it. This leads



us to suspect that the same influences which have operated upon the Passion matter have affected the Eschatological Discourse also. Taking then as our basis the treatment by Mt. and Lk. of the discourse matter of Mk. 1-12, and assuming that they have dealt in a similar manner with their Q matter, we get the following results :—

(1) Matthew's reports of Q matter will be about 3 per cent. longer than the original, and Luke's about 14·1 per cent. shorter.

(2) The words of Q matter which Matthew and Luke agree in reporting will be about 44·37 per cent. of the total number of words in their source.

(3) About 19·45 per cent. of Q's words will be peculiar to Matthew, and about 13·85 per cent. peculiar to Luke.

(4) Matthew's account will contain about 62·2 per cent. of the words of Q, and Luke's about 59 per cent.

(5) About 22·3 per cent. of Q's words will have been preserved by neither Matthew nor Luke.

(6) In Matthew's Q matter about 60·4 per cent. of his words will come from Q ; in Luke's about 68·7.

(7) About 21·5 per cent. of Matthew's words will contain substantial additions to Q ; about 1·4 only of Luke's.

(8) Matthew's matter will omit the substance of about 8·1 per cent. of Q ; Luke's that of about 6·15 per cent.

There is much food for reflection in these statistics taken singly. It is instructive also to compare them with each other—*e.g.* a comparison of (6) with (4) shows that whilst Matthew has probably preserved somewhat more of Q's words than Luke, yet Luke probably has more of Q's words in proportion to the length of his matter than Matthew has in proportion to the length of his. The lists are also helpful in showing the probable extent to which it may be possible to reconstruct the text of Q out of the materials contained in Matthew and Luke.

2. But we are not solely dependent on the evidence furnished by the Evangelists' use of Mark. There are certain other principles which can be applied to the Q matter in detail.

(a) It is natural to suppose that our Lord ordinarily spoke in Aramaic, and there can be little doubt that it is in Aramaic that His sayings were first remembered and treasured by His disciples. Thus, apart from the statement of Papias recorded by Eusebius (3<sup>39</sup>), it would be reasonable to suppose that the first written record of them was in Aramaic. If Q was written in Aramaic, the Greek translation of it probably used by our Evangelists was almost certainly the work of a Jewish Christian, and probably fairly literal in character. But, even if Q was originally written in Greek, its vocabulary and phraseology were probably much influenced by the Aramaic origin or tradition of the sayings.

We hold it then as a general principle that the form of our Lord's sayings which has the better claim to be considered original is that which is the more Aramaic in wording and construction, the more free from Hebraisms of every kind, as distinct from Aramaisms, the less literary and elegant from the point of Greek style and the more picturesque and Oriental in expression.

Here, too, we may add, as in textual criticism, the more difficult reading is usually to be preferred, because it is more likely for an easier version to be substituted for a difficult original than for the reverse process to take place.<sup>a</sup>

(b) Then, with regard to the matter in one of the Evangelists which is not represented in the other, certain criteria can be applied—*e.g.* we may suspect the originality of a word or phrase which is a favourite, either of the Evangelist who records it, or of the one who omits it.<sup>b</sup> For the Evangelist who records it may have inserted his favourite expression, and the one who omits it would have been likely to reproduce his favourite word or phrase, had he found it in his source. Conversely, if a word or phrase is conspicuous for its absence elsewhere from either the Evangelist who records it or the Evangelist who omits it,

<sup>a</sup> It must, however, be remembered that Luke has considerable command of the Greek language, and that therefore he may sometimes change the more ordinary reading of Q for a less common one.

<sup>b</sup> In the case of Luke, we have the evidence of the Acts as well as that of his Gospel.

# 30 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

that is a reason for thinking it original. Again, where a word or phrase also occurs in Mark, its treatment in the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke may be a useful guide. If it has been inserted by the Evangelist who has it into contexts drawn from Mark, or if it has not been omitted by the Evangelist who omits it from contexts drawn from Mark, that is reason for not accepting it as original to Q. Conversely, if the word or phrase has been omitted by the Evangelist who omits it from contexts drawn from Mark, or if it has not been inserted by the Evangelist who records it into contexts drawn from Mark, that is reason for accepting it as original to Q. These tests are of most value where the word or phrase is used in the same sense in Mark as in the Q passage, and occurs in a similar context.<sup>a</sup> And account must be taken of the source or sources of the passages where a word or phrase occurs, for it might be a favourite of an Evangelist's source rather than of the Evangelist himself.

TABLE IA.—NON-MARCAN MATTER FOUND IN MATTHEW AND LUKE  
FOLLOWING THE LUCAN ORDER

Lk. 3 <sup>7-9</sup> , <sup>17</sup>	= Mt. 3 <sup>7-10</sup> , <sup>12</sup>	Baptist's Preaching.
Lk. 4 <sup>8-13</sup>	= Mt. 4 <sup>8-11</sup>	Temptation.
Lk. 6 <sup>20-21</sup>	= Mt. 5 <sup>1, 2, 3, 4, 6</sup>	Beatitudes.
Lk. 6 <sup>22-23</sup>	= Mt. 5 <sup>11-12</sup>	Blessed are ye when men shall hate you.
Lk. 6 <sup>27-30</sup>	= Mt. 5 <sup>39, 40, 42</sup>	Love to Enemies and Non-Resistance to Evil.
Lk. 6 <sup>31</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>12</sup>	Golden Rule.
Lk. 6 <sup>32-36</sup>	= Mt. 5 <sup>44-48</sup>	Love to Enemies.
Lk. 6 <sup>37-38</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>1-2</sup>	Judge not. With what Measure.
Lk. 6 <sup>39</sup>	= Mt. 15 <sup>14</sup>	On Blind Guides.
Lk. 6 <sup>40</sup>	= Mt. 10 <sup>24-25</sup>	Disciple not above his Master.
Lk. 6 <sup>41-42</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>3-5</sup>	The Mote and the Beam.
Lk. 6 <sup>43-44</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>16-18</sup> , 12 <sup>33-34</sup>	The Good and the Bad Trees.
Lk. 6 <sup>45</sup>	= Mt. 12 <sup>35</sup>	The Good and the Bad Man.
Lk. 6 <sup>46</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>21</sup>	Saying Lord, Lord ; and Doing.
Lk. 6 <sup>47-49</sup>	= Mt. 7 <sup>24-27</sup>	The Two Builders.
Lk. 7 <sup>1b-3, 6-9</sup>	= Mt. 8 <sup>5-10</sup>	The Centurion's Servant.
Lk. 7 <sup>18-19, 22-28</sup>	= Mt. 11 <sup>2-11</sup>	Christ and the Baptist's Disciples.
Lk. 7 <sup>31-35</sup>	= Mt. 11 <sup>16-19</sup>	Parable of the discontented Children.

<sup>a</sup> There are exceptions, however, to their application—*e.g.*, in the case of the Matthaean expression 'The Kingdom of the heavens,' we cannot safely infer that, because Matthew has altered Mark, he has changed Q similarly. For it is possible that he gives it as he found it in Q, and that he substituted it for 'The Kingdom of God' which he found in Mark.

Lk. 9<sup>57-60</sup> = Mt. 8<sup>19-22</sup>  
 Lk. 10<sup>2</sup> = Mt. 9<sup>37-38</sup>  
 Lk. 10<sup>9b, 9a, 7b, 8</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>7, 8a, 10b,</sup>  
 (cf. 7<sup>a</sup>), 5-6, 12, 3 11-13, 15, 16a

(Mt. 10<sup>15</sup> is a  
 Doublet :)

Lk. 10<sup>12-15</sup> = Mt. 11<sup>21-24</sup>

Lk. 10<sup>16</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>40</sup>  
 Lk. 10<sup>21-22</sup> = Mt. 11<sup>25-27</sup>  
 Lk. 10<sup>23-24</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>16-17</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>2-4</sup> = Mt. 6<sup>9-13</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>9-13</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>7-11</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>14</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>22-23</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>19-20, 23</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>27-28, 30</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>24-26</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>43-45</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>16, 29-30</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>38-40</sup> (Doublet)  
 Lk. 11<sup>31-32</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>41-42</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>34-35</sup> = Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>39, 41, 42, 44, 47-48</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>25, 26, 23, 27, 29-31</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>46</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>4</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>49-51</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>34-36</sup>  
 Lk. 11<sup>52</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>13</sup>

Lk. 12<sup>2-9</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>26-33</sup>  
 (Lk. 12<sup>2</sup> is a Doublet : There is nothing  
 Lk. 12<sup>22-31</sup> = Mt. 6<sup>25-33</sup>  
 Lk. 12<sup>33b-34</sup> = Mt. 6<sup>20-21</sup>  
 Lk. 12<sup>39-40, 42-46</sup> = Mt. 24<sup>43-51a</sup>

Lk. 12<sup>51-53</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>34-36</sup>  
 Lk. 12<sup>58-59</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>25-26</sup>  
 Lk. 13<sup>20-21</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>33</sup>  
 Lk. 13<sup>23-24</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>13-14</sup>  
 Lk. 13<sup>25-27</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>22-23</sup>  
 Lk. 13<sup>28-29</sup> = Mt. 8<sup>11-12</sup>

Lk. 13<sup>34-35</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>37-39</sup>  
 Lk. 14<sup>5</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>11</sup>

Lk. 14<sup>11</sup> = Mt. 23<sup>12</sup>  
 (Doublet)

Lk. 14<sup>26</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>37</sup>  
 Lk. 14<sup>27</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>38</sup>  
 (A similar saying occurs Mk. 8<sup>34</sup> = Mt. 16<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 9<sup>23</sup>.)  
 Lk. 15<sup>4, 5, 7</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>12-14</sup>  
 Lk. 16<sup>13</sup> = Mt. 6<sup>24</sup>  
 Lk. 16<sup>16</sup> = Mt. 11<sup>12-13</sup>  
 Lk. 16<sup>17</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>18</sup>  
 Lk. 17<sup>1</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>7</sup>  
 Lk. 17<sup>3</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>15</sup>  
 Lk. 17<sup>4</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>21-22</sup>  
 Lk. 17<sup>6</sup> = Mt. 17<sup>20</sup>

(A similar saying occurs Mk. 11<sup>23</sup> = Mt. 21<sup>21</sup>.)

The Two Aspirants.  
 The Harvest and the Labourers.  
 Charge to the Twelve or the Seventy.

It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and  
 Gomorrah.

Woes on Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum.

He that receiveth, or heareth, you.

I thank Thee, Father.

Blessed are your eyes.

The Lord's Prayer.

Ask, Seek, Knock.

The Dumb (and Blind) Devil.

Beelzebub Discourse.

The Return of the Unclean Spirit.

Sign of Jonah.

Men of Nineveh and Queen of the South.

The Single and the Evil Eye.

Woes on the Pharisees.

Ye lade men with heavy Burdens.

I send unto you Prophets, etc.

Ye shut the Kingdom, or take away the  
 Key of Knowledge.

Exhortation to courageous Sincerity.

(covered up, etc.)

Against Anxiety for the Morrow.

Lay up Treasure in Heaven.

Thief in the Night and Prudent  
 Steward.

Not Peace but a Sword.

Agree with thine Adversary.

Parable of the Leaven.

The Narrow Gate or Door.

Final Rejection of the Unworthy.

They shall come from the East and  
 West.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem.

Which of you shall have a son or ox  
 (sheep) ?

Whoever exalteth himself, etc.

Father and Mother.

Taking our Cross.

Parable of the Lost Sheep.

No Man can serve Two Masters.

John and the Law and the Prophets.

Permanence of the Law.

On Offences.

If thy Brother sin.

If he sin against thee seven times.

Faith as a Grain of Mustard Seed.



Lk. 17 <sup>24</sup>	= Mt. 24 <sup>27</sup>	As the Lightning, etc.
Lk. 17 <sup>26-27</sup>	= Mt. 24 <sup>37-39</sup>	As in the Days of Noah, etc.
Lk. 17 <sup>34-35</sup>	= Mt. 24 <sup>40-41</sup>	One is chosen and the other left.
Lk. 17 <sup>37</sup>	= Mt. 24 <sup>28</sup>	Where the Body is, etc.
Lk. 18 <sup>14</sup>	= Mt. 23 <sup>12</sup>	Whoever exalteth himself, etc.
(Doublet)		
Lk. 22 <sup>28, 30</sup>	= Mt. 19 <sup>28</sup>	Ye shall sit on Twelve Thrones, etc.

TABLE IB.—NON-MARCAN MATTER FOUND IN MATTHEW AND LUKE  
FOLLOWING THE MATTHAEAN ORDER

Mt. 3 <sup>7-10, 12</sup>	= Lk. 3 <sup>7-9, 17</sup>	Baptist's Preaching.
Mt. 4 <sup>3-11</sup>	= Lk. 4 <sup>3-13</sup>	Temptation.
Mt. 5 <sup>1, 2, 3, 4, 6</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>20-21</sup>	Beatitudes.
Mt. 5 <sup>11-12</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>22-23</sup>	Blessed are ye when men shall hate you.
Mt. 5 <sup>18</sup>	= Lk. 16 <sup>17</sup>	Permanence of the Law.
Mt. 5 <sup>25-26</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>58-59</sup>	Agree with thine Adversary.
Mt. 5 <sup>39, 40, 42</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>27-30</sup>	Love to Enemies and Non-Resistance to Evil.
Mt. 5 <sup>44-48</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>32-36</sup>	Love to Enemies.
Mt. 6 <sup>9-13</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>2-4</sup>	The Lord's Prayer.
Mt. 6 <sup>20-21</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>33b-34</sup>	Lay up Treasure in Heaven.
Mt. 6 <sup>22-23</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>34-35</sup>	The Single and the Evil Eye.
Mt. 6 <sup>24</sup>	= Lk. 16 <sup>13</sup>	No Man can serve Two Masters.
Mt. 6 <sup>25-33</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>22-31</sup>	Against Anxiety for the Morrow.
Mt. 7 <sup>1-2</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>37-38</sup>	Judge not. With what Measure.
Mt. 7 <sup>3-5</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>41-42</sup>	The Mote and the Beam.
Mt. 7 <sup>7-11</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>9-13</sup>	Ask, Seek, Knock.
Mt. 7 <sup>12</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>31</sup>	Golden Rule.
Mt. 7 <sup>13-14</sup>	= Lk. 13 <sup>23-24</sup>	The Narrow Gate or Door.
Mt. 7 <sup>16-18</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>43-44</sup>	The Good and the Bad Trees.
Mt. 7 <sup>21</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>46</sup>	Saying Lord, Lord, and Doing.
Mt. 7 <sup>22-23</sup>	= Lk. 13 <sup>25-27</sup>	Final Rejection of the Unworthy.
Mt. 7 <sup>24-27</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>47-49</sup>	The Two Builders.
Mt. 8 <sup>5-10</sup>	= Lk. 7 <sup>1b-3, 6-9</sup>	The Centurion's Servant.
Mt. 8 <sup>11-12</sup>	= Lk. 13 <sup>28-29</sup>	They shall come from the East and West.
Mt. 8 <sup>19-22</sup>	= Lk. 9 <sup>57-60</sup>	The Two Aspirants.
Mt. 9 <sup>37-38</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>2</sup>	The Harvest and the Labourers.
Mt. 10 <sup>7, 8a, 10b, 11-13, 15, 16a</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>9b, 9a, 7b, 8 (cf. 7a), 5-6, 12, 3</sup>	Charge to the Twelve or the Seventy.
(Mt. 10 <sup>15</sup> is a Doublet : It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah.)		
Mt. 10 <sup>24-25</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>40</sup>	Disciple not above his Master.
Mt. 10 <sup>26-33</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>2-9</sup>	Exhortation to courageous Sincerity.
(Lk. 12 <sup>2</sup> is a Doublet : There is nothing covered up, etc.)		
Mt. 10 <sup>34-36</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>51-53</sup>	Not Peace but a Sword.
Mt. 10 <sup>37</sup>	= Lk. 14 <sup>26</sup>	Father and Mother.
Mt. 10 <sup>38</sup>	= Lk. 14 <sup>27</sup>	Taking our Cross.
(A similar saying occurs Mk. 8 <sup>34</sup> = Mt. 16 <sup>24</sup> = Lk. 9 <sup>23</sup> .)		
Mt. 10 <sup>40</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>16</sup>	He that receiveth, or heareth, you.
Mt. 11 <sup>2-11</sup>	= Lk. 7 <sup>18-19, 22-28</sup>	Christ and the Baptist's Disciples.
Mt. 11 <sup>12-13</sup>	= Lk. 16 <sup>16</sup>	John and the Law and the Prophets.

Mt. 11 <sup>16-19</sup>	= Lk. 7 <sup>31-35</sup>	Parable of the discontented Children.
Mt. 11 <sup>21-24</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>12-15</sup>	Woes on Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum.
Mt. 11 <sup>25-27</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>21-22</sup>	I thank Thee, Father.
Mt. 12 <sup>11</sup>	= Lk. 14 <sup>5</sup>	Which of you shall have a sheep (son or ox) ?
Mt. 12 <sup>22-23</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>14</sup>	The Dumb (and Blind) Devil.
Mt. 12 <sup>27-28, 30</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>19-20, 23</sup>	Beelzebub Discourse.
Mt. 12 <sup>33-34</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>43-44</sup>	The Good and the Bad Trees.
(Doublet)		
Mt. 12 <sup>35</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>45</sup>	The Good and the Bad Man.
Mt. 12 <sup>38-40</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>16, 29-30</sup>	Sign of Jonah.
(Doublet)		
Mt. 12 <sup>41-42</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>31-32</sup>	Men of Nineveh and Queen of the South.
Mt. 12 <sup>43-45</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>24-26</sup>	The Return of the Unclean Spirit.
Mt. 13 <sup>16-17</sup>	= Lk. 10 <sup>23-24</sup>	Blessed are your Eyes.
Mt. 13 <sup>33</sup>	= Lk. 13 <sup>20-21</sup>	Parable of the Leaven.
Mt. 15 <sup>14</sup>	= Lk. 6 <sup>39</sup>	On Blind Guides.
Mt. 17 <sup>20</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>6</sup>	Faith as a Grain of Mustard Seed.
(A similar saying occurs Mk. 11 <sup>23</sup> = Mt. 21 <sup>21</sup> .)		
Mt. 18 <sup>7</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>1</sup>	On Offences.
Mt. 18 <sup>12-14</sup>	= Lk. 15 <sup>4, 5, 7</sup>	Parable of the Lost Sheep.
Mt. 18 <sup>15</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>3</sup>	If thy Brother sin.
Mt. 18 <sup>21-22</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>4</sup>	If he sin against thee seven times.
Mt. 19 <sup>28</sup>	= Lk. 22 <sup>28, 30</sup>	Ye shall sit on Twelve Thrones, etc.
Mt. 23 <sup>4</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>46</sup>	Ye lade men with heavy Burdens.
Mt. 23 <sup>12</sup>	= Lk. 14 <sup>11, 18 14</sup>	Whoever exalteth himself, etc.
Mt. 23 <sup>13</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>52</sup>	Ye shut the Kingdom, or take away the Key of Knowledge.
Mt. 23 <sup>23, 25-27, 29-31</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>42, 39, 41, 44, 47-48</sup>	Woes on the Pharisees.
Mt. 23 <sup>34-36</sup>	= Lk. 11 <sup>49-51</sup>	I send unto you Prophets, etc.
Mt. 23 <sup>37-39</sup>	= Lk. 13 <sup>34-35</sup>	Jerusalem, Jerusalem.
Mt. 24 <sup>27</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>24</sup>	As the Lightning, etc.
Mt. 24 <sup>28</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>37</sup>	Where the Body is, etc.
Mt. 24 <sup>37-39</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>26-27</sup>	As in the Days of Noah, etc.
Mt. 24 <sup>40-41</sup>	= Lk. 17 <sup>34-35</sup>	One is chosen and the Other left.
Mt. 24 <sup>43-51a</sup>	= Lk. 12 <sup>39-40, 42-46</sup>	Thief in the Night, and Prudent Steward.

TABLE IC.—OTHER NON-MARCAN MATTER FOUND IN MATTHEW AND LUKE,  
OF MORE DOUBTFUL CORRESPONDENCE

Mt. 22 <sup>1-10</sup>	<i>Cf.</i> Lk. 14 <sup>15-24</sup>	Parables of the King's Son and the Great Supper.
Mt. 25 <sup>14-30</sup>	<i>Cf.</i> Lk. 19 <sup>11-28</sup>	Parables of the Talents and Pounds.
Mt. 21 <sup>31b-32</sup>	<i>Cf.</i> Lk. 7 <sup>29-30</sup>	The Baptist and the Publicans.

TABLE IIA.—STATISTICS RESPECTING THE NARRATIVE AND DISCOURSE MATTER OF MARK REPRODUCED BY BOTH MATTHEW AND LUKE

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Matthew.	Parallel Passage of Luke.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Matthew.	Total No. of Words in Luke.	Marcan Words reproduced by both Matthew and Luke.	Marcan Words reproduced by Matthew only.	Marcan Words reproduced by Luke only.	Marcan Words reproduced by neither Matthew nor Luke.	Words in Matthaean Substantial Additions.	Words in Lucan Substantial Additions.	Words of Matthaean Substantial Omissions.	Words of Lucan Substantial Omissions.
I 22	7 28b-29	4 31b-32	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
I 29-31	8 14-15	4 38-39	18	20	20	9	8	1	...	...	...	...	...
I 32-34	8 16-17	4 40-41	44	30	38	13½	5½	9	16	...	...	...	...
I 39	4 23	4 44	46	36	52	5½	3½	13	21	18	...	9	9
I 40-45	8 1-4	5 12-16	15	27	8	6	3	1	5	...	...	...	4
2 1-12	9 1-8	5 17-26	97	62	98	38	5	13	41	...	...	29	...
2 13-17	9 9-13	5 27-32	196	127	212	63½	19	29½	84	...	...	38	...
2 18-22	9 14-17	5 33-39	110	93	94	50½	16½	10	33	10	...	...	...
2 23-28	12 1-8	6 1-5	129	103	140	66	22	18½	22½	...	12	...	...
3 1-6	12 9-14	6 6-11	108	136	98	52½	8	18½	29½	44	...	13	13
3 16-19a	10 2-4	6 12-16	95	89	115	24½	17	27½	26	27	...	...	...
3 31-35	12 46-50	8 13b-16	58	53	48	23	13	6½	15½	...	...	...	...
4 1-9	13 1-9	8 19-21	79	89	54	25	30	4	20	...	...	...	...
4 10-12	13 10-11, 13-15	8 4-8	151	132	90	50	50½	6½	44	...	...	...	...
4 13-20	13 18-23	8 9-10	53	101	36	20	11	5	17	55	...	...	...
4 25	13 12	8 11-15	146	128	109	48½	41½	12½	43½	...	...	...	...
4 35-41	8 18-27	8 18b	15	17	18	13	1	1	...	...	...	...	...
5 1-20	8 28-34	8 22-25	118	154	94	31	21	16	50	69	...	...	...
5 21-43	9 18-26	8 26-39	325	135	293	61	17	104	143	...	...	122	19
6 14-16	14 1-2	8 40-56	374	142	281	44	31½	99½	199	...	...	189	14
6 30-44	14 13-21	9 7-9	54	34	53	7	10	18	19	...	...	15	...
8 27-9¹	16 13-28	9 10-17	236	157	164	58	37	16½	124½	...	...	...	...
9 2-8	17 1-8	9 18-27	277	347	197	118	59½	27½	72	81	...	...	39
9 14-29	17 14-20	9 28-36	121	144	164	58	23½	6	33½	...	...	...	...
9 30-32	17 22-23	9 37-43a	270	133	124	26	27	23½	193½	23	...	128	153
		9 43b-45	47	30	54	8	9	11½	18½	...	...	...	...

[illegible]



TABLE IIB.—STATISTICS RESPECTING THE NARRATIVE AND DISCOURSE MATTER  
OF MARK REPRODUCED BY MATTHEW ONLY AND BY LUKE ONLY

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Matthew.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Matthew.	No. of Marcan Words reproduced by Matthew.	No. of Marcan Words not reproduced by Matthew.	No. of Words in Matthaean Substantial Additions.	No. of Words of Matthaean Substantial Omissions.
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I 14-15	4 12-17	33	81	12	21	57	8
I 16-20	4 18-22	82	89	62	20	...	...
4 33-34	13 34-35	25	34	7	18	19	8
6 1-6a	13 53-58	126	107	75½	50½	...	14
6 17-29	14 3-12	247	135	93	154	...	24
6 45-52	14 22-33	137	184	75	62	66	...
6 53-56	14 34-36	72	44	33	39	...	...
7 1-23	15 1-20	360	278	172½	187½	43	56
7 24-30	15 21-23	132	139	40	92	44	...
7 31-37	15 29-31	113	63	12	101	...	64
8 1-10	15 32-39	146	130	89	57	...	...
8 11-21	16 1-12	153	180	60½	92½	65	...
9 9-13	17 9-13	91	88	46	45	11	13
9 42-48	18 6-9	121	121	72½	48½	21	37
10 1-12	19 1-12	148	220	92	56	62	10
10 35-40	20 20-23	111	93	57½	53½	...	...
11 11	21 10-11	21	27	4	17	22	17
11 12-14	21 18-19a	55	38	24	31	...	...
11 19-25	21 17, 19b-22	109	72	54½	54½	...	24
12 28-34a	22 34-40	144	80	35	109	19	78
		(2426)	(2203)	(1117)	(1309)	(429)	(353)
13 20-23	24 22-25	58	54	44½	13½	...	...
13 32	24 36	22	22	19	3	...	...
		(80)	(76)	(63½)	(16½)	...	...
14 3-9	26 6-13	125	109	79½	45½	...	...
15 16-20a	27 27-31a	63	77	43	20	...	...
		(188)	(186)	(122½)	(65½)	...	...
Totals including Passion Matter		2694	2465	1303	1391	429	353
Totals from Table IIA including Passion Matter		6936	6535	3715½	3220½	735	713
Gross Totals including Passion Matter		9630	9000	5018½	4611½	1164	1066
Totals excluding Passion Matter		2506	2279	1180½	1325½	429	353
Totals from Table IIA excluding Passion Matter		5146	4541	2605½	2540½	537	655
Gross Totals excluding Passion Matter		7652	6820	3785½	3866½	966	1008
Totals of Passion Matter only		188	186	122½	65½	...	...
Totals from Table IIA of Passion Matter only		1790	1994	1110	680	198	58
Gross Totals of Passion Matter only		1978	2180	1232½	745½	198	58
		1	2	3	4	5	6

TABLE IIB.—*continued.*

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Luke.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Luke.	No. of Marcan Words reproduced by Luke.	No. of Marcan Words not reproduced by Luke.	No. of Words in Lucan Substantial Additions.	No. of Words of Lucan Substantial Omissions.
I 23-28	4 33-37	91	92	60½	30½	...	...
I 35-38	4 42-43	47	46	11	36	...	...
3 13-15	6 12-13a	36	28	9½	26½	...	...
4 21-22, 24a	8 16-18a	45	43	20	25	...	...
6 7-13	9 1-6	100	91	46½	53½	...	...
9 38-40	9 49-50	51	37	30	21	...	15
I2 38-40	20 45-47	44	47	36	8	...	...
I2 41-44	21 1-4	75	58	38	37	...	...
Totals . . . . .		489	442	251½	237½	...	15
Totals from Table IIA including Passion Matter . .		6936	6017	2979½	3956½	292	772
Gross Totals including Passion Matter . .		7425	6459	3230⅔	4194½	292	787
Totals . . . . .		489	442	251½	237½	...	15
Totals from Table IIA excluding Passion Matter .		5146	4508	2409⅔	2736⅓	54	324
Gross Totals excluding Passion Matter . .		5635	4950	2661⅓	2973⅝	54	339
Totals of Passion Narratives only . . . . .		...	...	...	...	...	...
Totals from Table IIA of Passion Matter only .		1790	1509	569½	1220½	238	448
Gross Totals of Passion Matter only . .		1790	1509	569½	1220½	238	448
		1	2	3	4	5	6

TABLE IIc.—STATISTICS RESPECTING THE DISCOURSE MATTER OF MARK REPRODUCED BY BOTH MATTHEW AND LUKE

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Matthew.	Parallel Passage of Luke.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Matthew.	Total No. of Words in Luke.	Marcan Words				Marcan Words reproduced by neither Matthew nor Luke.		Words in Matthaean Substantial Additions.	Words in Lucan Substantial Additions.	Words of Matthaean Substantial Omissions.	Words of Lucan Substantial Omissions.
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1 41, 44 (part)	8 2, 4 (part)	5 13, 14 (part)	24	21	22	16	2	4	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
2 6, 8b-11 (part)	9 2, 4b-6 (part)	5 20, 22b-24 (part)	60	53	54	44	2	2	11	...	...	...	...	...	...
2 17b	9 12b-13	5 31b-32	16	27	18	15	1	3	...	10	...	...	...	...	...
2 19b-22	9 15b-17	5 34b-39	93	78	110	51	14	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
2 25-28 (part)	12 3b-8	6 3b-5	69	88	53	36½	2	7½	22½	44	...	...	...	...	...
3 3-5 (passim)	12 11-13 (passim)	6 8-10 (passim)	18	37	23	7½	...	10	...	27	...	...	...	...	...
3 32-35 (passim)	12 48-50 (passim)	8 21 (part)	31	39	15	7	22	6½	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
4 2-9	13 3b-9	8 5-8	103	91	73	45	30½	3	21	...	...	...	...	...	...
4 11b-13	13 11b, 13-15	8 10b	35	84	22	17	10	12½	5	55	...	...	...	...	...
4 13b-20	13 18-23	8 11-15	143	128	109	48½	41½	12½	40½	...	...	...	...	...	...
4 25	13 12	8 18b	15	17	18	13	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
4 35-41 (passim)	8 18-27 (passim)	8 22-25 (passim)	12	39	13	4½	3	1½	4	31	...	...	...	...	...
5 8, 9, 19 (part)	None	8 29, 30, 39 (part)	30	...	24	...	...	19½	10½	...	...	30	...	...	...
5 21-43 (passim)	9 18-26 (passim)	8 40-56 (passim)	37	18	39	10	1	10	16	...	...	7	...	...	...
6 21, 27, 38 (part)	14 16, 18 (part)	9 13, 14 (part)	20	12	10	5	...	...	15	...	...	...	...	...	...
8 27-g (passim)	16 13-28 (passim)	9 18-27 (passim)	172	239	137	96	31	22	23	75	...	...	...	...	...
9 14-29 (passim)	17 14-20 (passim)	9 37-43a (passim)	64	45	18	9	5	2	48	23	...	...	...	...	...
9 31 (part)	17 22-23 (part)	9 44	17	17	19	8	6	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
9 33b-37 (passim)	18 8b-5	9 48	41	49	31	10	2	4	25	36	...	...	...	...	...

[illegible]



TABLE IID.—STATISTICS RESPECTING THE DISCOURSE MATTER OF MARK  
REPRODUCED BY MATTHEW ONLY AND BY LUKE ONLY

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Matthew.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Matthew.	No. of Marcan Words reproduced by Matthew.	No. of Marcan Words not reproduced by Matthew.	No. of Words in Matthaean Substantial Additions.	No. of Words of Matthaean Substantial Omissions.
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I 15	4 17b	15	7	4	11	...	8
I 17b	4 19b	9	8	8	1	...	...
6 4b	I3 57b	20	14	14	6	...	...
6 50b	I4 27-31 ( <i>passim</i> )	5	10	5	...	5	...
7 6b-23 ( <i>passim</i> )	I4 25-20 ( <i>passim</i> )	229	209	140½	88½	25	...
7 27b, 29b	I5 24b, 26b, 28b	30	33	14	16	11	...
7 34b	I5 29-31	4	...	...	4	...	4
8 2-3, 5b	I5 32b, 34b	36	30	26	10	...	...
8 12b-21 ( <i>passim</i> )	I6 2b-11 ( <i>passim</i> )	78	107	36	42	46	...
9 12b-13	I7 11b-12	35	33	18	17	...	...
9 42-48	I8 6-9	121	121	72½	48½	21	37
I0 3b-12 ( <i>passim</i> )	I9 4b-12 ( <i>passim</i> )	77	126 (+5)	62	15	41	10
I0 36b-40 ( <i>passim</i> )	20 21b-23 ( <i>passim</i> )	51	39	31	20	...	...
II 14 (part)	21 19 (part)	9	9	7	2	...	...
II 22b-25	I7 21b-22	73	38	38	35	...	24
I2 29b-34a ( <i>passim</i> )	22 37b-40	61	49	27	34	19	11
		(853)	(838)	(503)	(350)	(168)	(94)
I3 20-23	24 22-25	58	54	44½	13½	...	...
I3 32	24 36	22	22	19	3	...	...
		(80)	(76)	(63½)	(16½)	...	...
I4 6b-9	26 10b-13	63	59	45	18	...	...
		(63)	(59)	(45)	(18)	...	...
Totals including Passion Matter		996	973	611½	384½	168	94
Totals from Table IIC including Passion Matter . . .		2421	2599	1598½	822½	450	157
Gross Totals including Passion Matter. . . .		3417	3572	2210½	1206½	618	251
Totals excluding Passion Matter		933	914	566½	366½	168	94
Totals from Table IIC excluding Passion Matter . . .		2099	2210	1357½	741½	401	144
Gross Totals excluding Passion Matter . . . .		3032	3124	1924½	1107½	569	238
Totals of Passion Matter only . . . .		63	59	45	18	...	...
Totals from Table IIC of Passion Matter only . . . .		322	389	241	81	49	13
Gross Totals of Passion Matter only . . . .		385	448	286	99	49	13
		1	2	3	4	5	6

TABLE IID.—continued.

Passage of Mark.	Parallel Passage of Luke.	Total No. of Words in Mark.	Total No. of Words in Luke.	No. of Marcan Words reproduced by Luke.	No. of Marcan Words not reproduced by Luke.	No. of Words in Lucan Substantial Additions.	No. of Words of Lucan Substantial Omissions.
I 25b	4 35 (part)	5	5	4	1	...	...
I 38b	4 43b	13	15	1	12	...	...
4 21-22, 24a (part)	8 16-18a	38	43	20	18	...	...
6 10b-11	9 3b-5	34	51	21½	12½	...	...
9 38b-40 (part)	9 49b-50 (part)	43	28	26	17	...	...
I2 38b-40	20 46-47	38	39	36	2	...	...
I2 43b-44	21 3b-4	38	35	28	10	...	...
Totals . . . . .		209	216	136½	72½	...	...
Totals from Table IIC <i>including</i> Passion Matter . . . . .		2421	2135	1298⅔	1122⅓	104	210
Gross Totals <i>including</i> Passion Matter . . . . .		2630	2351	1435½	1194⅝	104	210
Totals . . . . .		209	216	136½	72½	...	...
Totals from Table IIC <i>excluding</i> Passion Matter . . . . .		2099	1835	1169⅔	929⅓	27	128
Gross Totals <i>excluding</i> Passion Matter . . . . .		2308	2051	1306½	1001⅝	27	128
Totals of Passion Matter only . . . . .		...	...	..	...	...	...
Totals from Table IIC of Passion Matter only . . . . .		322	300	129	193	77	82
Gross Totals of Passion Matter only . . . . .		322	300	129	193	77	82
		1	2	3	4	5	6

# THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

## PART I.—CRITICAL

### CHAPTER IV

#### THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN THE MINISTRY, AND THE PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED

We are now in a position to proceed to the detailed consideration of the critical problems raised by the Sermon. It will be of help to us if we can approach our subject with a clearly formed judgment as to the historical circumstances of the delivery of the Discourse. We will therefore devote a chapter to the consideration of the place of the Sermon in the Ministry, and of the original recipients of the message.

I. THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN THE MINISTRY.—Matthew and Luke insert the Sermon at different points into the Marcan framework. Matthew inserts it at a very early point. In 4<sup>12-22</sup> he has matter parallel to Mk. 1<sup>14-15</sup>, which relates the beginning of the Galilean ministry, and to Mk. 1<sup>16-20</sup>, which describes the Call of the first four Disciples. In 4<sup>23-25</sup> he relates a tour of Galilee by our Lord, during which His preaching and healing drew to His side large crowds of followers. Then in 5<sup>1-2</sup> he states that 'seeing the multitudes, He went up into the mountain,' and delivered the Sermon. In 7<sup>28b-29</sup> he describes the effect of the Discourse on the multitudes in language parallel to that of Mk. 1<sup>22</sup>. Luke, on the other hand, places the Discourse at a later point in the Marcan framework. Lk. 6<sup>12-16</sup> is parallel to Mk. 3<sup>13-19</sup>, which relates the Call of the Twelve.

There is much to lead us to prefer Luke's placing to that of Matthew, and to accept Luke's as giving the historical occasion of the delivery of the Sermon.

(a) Its position in Matthew can be satisfactorily explained as due to the editor's arrangement of his materials. There is a larger proportion of discourse matter in relation to the whole in the First Gospel than in either of the other Synoptics. (Approximately three-fourths of Matthew consists of discourse matter; Luke has about two-thirds; Mark only about half.) This seems to indicate that the compiler attached great importance to discourse. If so, he would naturally insert a discourse of our Lord at the earliest convenient point in the Marcan narrative. Probably the Sermon was the first Discourse of Christ recorded in Q, and it is possible that the mention of our Lord as teaching in Mk. 1<sup>21</sup> suggested to the compiler its insertion at this point.

Moreover, in Matthew itself there are not wanting signs that the Sermon belongs historically to a later date. Mt. 4<sup>23-25</sup> implies a ministry of considerable extent and duration. Its phraseology is paralleled in different contexts of Mark, and it is noteworthy that it has much parallelism in thought, and some in wording, with Mk. 3<sup>7-10</sup>, which precedes in Mark the choice of the Twelve.<sup>a</sup> It looks as though we have here an editorial summary intended to epitomise the whole of the Galilaean Ministry up to this point. Perhaps also it is not without significance that the Sermon in Matthew is placed after a call of disciples, viz. that of the first four. The editor might have introduced it at an even earlier point in the Marcan narrative, viz. Mk. 1<sup>15</sup>, which contains the first mention of Christ as preaching.

Another important fact is that Matthew nowhere records the appointment of the Twelve to the Apostolate. He gives the list of the Twelve in Mt. 10<sup>2-4</sup>, but προσκαλεσάμενος in 10<sup>1</sup> refers, not to the calling of disciples which preceded the original choice of the Twelve, but to a subsequent calling of the Twelve, previously chosen, to receive the charge on being sent forth, and the endowments to equip them for their mission work. It is possible, indeed, as οἱ μαθηταί in Matthew generally refers to the Disciples in the stricter sense, that οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ in Mt. 5<sup>1</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Cf. the synopsis at the end of this chapter.



implies that the editor knew that the Twelve had already received their formal call at the time of the delivery of the Sermon.

It is worthy of notice, too, that the mention of great multitudes following our Lord, with which Matthew introduces in 8<sup>1</sup> the story of the healing of the leper, which immediately follows the Sermon, is incongruous with the injunction to secrecy recorded in 8<sup>4</sup>.

(b) Luke's placing, on the other hand, has much in its favour. It is supported by the combined data of Mark and Matthew. Mk. 3<sup>13 ff.</sup> states that our Lord went up into the mountain (εἰς τὸ ὄρος), and appointed the Twelve. Mt. 5<sup>1 ff.</sup> states that He went up into the mountain (εἰς τὸ ὄρος as before), and delivered the Sermon. Putting these two accounts together, we learn that our Lord went up into the mountain, appointed the Twelve, and delivered the Sermon; which is what Luke states in 6<sup>12 ff.</sup> Again, prior to this section, Luke has been steadily following Mark for some time. His insertions into Mark occur at comparatively few places. It is probable that he had good reason for inserting his lesser interpolation at this point. Possibly he possessed information independent of what could be learned from Q. But it is not improbable that Luke's placing is that which was indicated in Q itself. For it is reasonable to suppose that Q contained some introduction to the Sermon. Lk. 6<sup>17-20</sup> may be drawn, wholly or in part, from that introduction. It has, indeed, parallels of wording with Mk. 3<sup>7-12</sup>, but it is not necessarily on that account drawn from it. It also has a considerable amount of parallelism with Mt. 4<sup>23-5<sup>2</sup>.\*</sup> Lk. 6<sup>17</sup> implies the relation in the preceding matter of at least the fact of the choice of the Twelve, if not also of their names. Perhaps we may explain Luke's desertion here of Mark's order as due to his following the order of his Q source. It is not impossible that Q may also have contained a detailed list of the Apostles. If Luke followed Q here instead of Mark, that would explain his differences from Mark, both in the order of the names and in the names themselves. Matthew's list is much closer to Mark's than to Luke's,

\* Cf. the synopsis at the end of this chapter.

but he has two points of agreement with Luke against Mark, viz. these: he places Andrew next in order after Simon Peter, and adds to his name the words 'his brother.' Another reason in favour of Luke's placing is that the teaching which we shall include in Q's Sermon is not of an elementary character. It is reasonable to suppose that it had been preceded by a good deal of instruction. Indeed the Lucan setting is most appropriate and historically probable. The hearts of all Christ's followers must have been deeply moved by His definite appointment of the Twelve. The number chosen could not fail to remind them of the tribes of Israel. We imagine that they would be eminently receptive of the seed of His teaching. Moreover, the importance of the choice in the mind of Christ is indicated by the fact recorded by Luke that He spent the preceding night in solitary prayer on the mountain (Lk. 6<sup>12</sup>). It was both natural and fitting that He should avail Himself of the occasion to explain and enforce the new moral ideal which His followers were to set before themselves, and to proclaim to others. Indeed it is almost incredible that our Lord should not, at this important epoch in the Ministry, have delivered an address to His disciples.

1. Accepting, then, Luke's placing, we notice first that the narratives of Mark and John record a considerable extent of active ministry as having preceded the Sermon. Taking their evidence as it stands, the Discourse was delivered not long after the incident of the disciples' plucking of the ears of corn recorded in Mk. 2<sup>23-28</sup>. The harvest was then ripe, but not yet cut. If we may trust Luke's addition to Mark's narrative that the disciples rubbed the ears in their hands (Lk. 6<sup>1</sup>), and if we understand these to have been ears of wheat, the date would be some time after the Passover, about May or June. The Sermon would then be dated about harvest-time, or shortly after. This agrees well with the next indication of date in Mark, viz. the mention of the green grass at the Feeding of the Five Thousand in Mk. 6<sup>39</sup>, which (along with the statement of Jn. 6<sup>4</sup> that the Passover was at hand) clearly indicates early spring. For, between the choice of the Twelve and the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mark

records a considerable extent of ministry, which may well have occupied the intervening months.

Accepting, then, this date for the Sermon, the actual duration of the preceding ministry will be differently estimated, according as the entire Ministry is regarded as having lasted two to three years, or three to four. John records that the Galilaean Ministry was preceded by a Judeaan, and that this began some time before the Passover of Jn. 2<sup>13</sup>. If the plucking of the ears of corn of Mk. 2<sup>23-28</sup> is assigned to the same year as this Passover, the interval of time will have been about six months. It seems more reasonable, however, to assign it to the next year. For, in Jn. 3<sup>22</sup> we read that Christ tarried (διέτριβε) in Judaea after the Passover of Jn. 2<sup>13</sup>, and the more natural interpretation of Jn. 4<sup>35</sup> seems to be (as Westcott holds) that the material harvest was four months ahead when Christ spoke the words—*i.e.* that they were delivered about the month of January. Moreover, the other view seems unduly to compress the early Galilaean Ministry. If we hold, then, that the opening of the Galilaean Ministry belongs to the year following the Passover of the early Judeaan Ministry, the delivery of the Sermon will have been preceded by healing and teaching activities extending over a period of some eighteen months. If we may date the Passover of Jn. 2<sup>13</sup> in A.D. 26, the date of the Sermon will thus probably be the summer of A.D. 27.

2. Further, according to Mark's data, the occasion of the Sermon was one of the great turning-points of the Ministry. For some time previously the Pharisees and their Scribes had entertained growing feelings of animosity against our Lord. These culminated in a plot against His life. The occasion was the healing of a man with a withered hand on a Sabbath in the synagogue at Capernaum. So incensed were the Pharisees that they 'went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against Him, how they might destroy Him' (Mk. 3<sup>6</sup>). Then it was that Jesus withdrew to the sea from Capernaum, and thence went up into the mountain, and appointed the Twelve (Mk. 3<sup>7-19</sup>). Hitherto He had often been present at the services of the synagogue and taught there. In the subsequent ministry

Mark records but one visit to a synagogue, viz. the occasion when He came to Nazareth (Mk. 6<sup>1a</sup>). It was shortly after the crisis of Mk. 3<sup>6</sup> that we first read of our Lord as speaking in parables, and as declaring to His disciples that unto them that are without (ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω) all things are done in parables; that (in the language of Is. 6<sup>9-10</sup>) seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them (Mk. 4<sup>11b-12</sup>). In the whole of the subsequent Ministry the training of these twelve men holds a prominent place. Thus, according to Mark, the Sermon dates from the first of the great crises and turning-points of the Ministry, one comparable in importance with those occasioned later by the purpose of the multitudes to take our Lord by force and to make Him king, after the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Jn. 6<sup>15</sup>), and by the confession of Christ's Messiahship by Peter on the withdrawal to the villages of Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8<sup>27</sup>).

Such is the place of the Sermon in the Ministry, according to the evidence of Mark and John. But the question has to be faced, Is that evidence reliable?

(a) It is certainly remarkable that John is the only Evangelist who records a Judæan Ministry as having preceded the Ministry in Galilee which began, according to the Synoptists, after the Baptist's imprisonment. This is the more so as, according to John, Peter was one of the first men to follow our Lord (Jn. 1<sup>41-42</sup>). But there is much in the Synoptists which supports the historicity of John's narrative of this early Ministry in the south. We cannot lay stress on the well-attested reading in Lk. 4<sup>44</sup> 'And He was preaching in the synagogues of Judæa,' because Luke seems to be using the word 'Judæa' here, as in Lk. 23<sup>5</sup>, Acts 10<sup>37</sup>, and probably elsewhere, in an extended sense of the whole Roman province called by that name. But it is much easier to understand the fame of our Lord in the south, and the coming down of Scribes from Jerusalem to the scenes of His Galilaean Ministry (*cf.* Mk. 3<sup>22</sup>), if He had engaged in active ministry in Jerusalem and Judæa before the inception of the Galilaean Ministry—*e.g.*



according to Mk. 3<sup>7-8</sup> the great multitude which followed our Lord in His withdrawal to the sea included people from Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, and beyond Jordan. Then there is the remarkable correspondence between the accusation brought against our Lord at His trial (Mk. 14<sup>58</sup>; cf. 15<sup>29</sup>) and the answer which, according to Jn. 2<sup>19</sup>, He returned to those who asked of Him a sign on the occasion of His first cleansing of the Temple. So far as our records inform us, this was the only occasion on which our Lord spoke such words.

(b) With regard to Mark, it will be convenient at this point to consider the question of the chronological order of the Gospel as a whole, as well as that of the particular narratives which precede the choice of the Twelve. According to Eusebius ('Eccl. Hist.' bk. 3, c. 39), Papias recorded a statement of 'the Elder' that Mark wrote accurately, but not in order, the things which were either said or done by Christ. As there are other kinds of order besides the temporal, this statement is not free from ambiguity. In the same passage 'the Elder' attests the close connexion between our Second Gospel and the Apostle Peter, and it may be argued that the first of the Apostles is as likely as any one to have known and remembered the actual succession of events. But it is rather to the internal evidence supplied by the Gospel itself that we must look for guidance. Here there is much which argues strongly in favour of Mark's order being, at least broadly speaking, a chronological one. We can trace development from stage to stage—*e.g.* in the hostility of the Pharisees, in the scenes of the Ministry, in the methods and substance of Christ's teaching, in Christ's revelation of His Passion and of His Messiahship, and in the Apostles' belief in that Messiahship. The whole picture of the course of the Ministry called up before the mind by a careful study of the Gospel is essentially reasonable and self-consistent. There may, indeed, be some signs of grouping, as in the parables of the fourth chapter. Mr. Cuthbert Turner is inclined to see evidence of such grouping in the section Mk. 1<sup>21-36</sup> in the fact that five miracles in 1<sup>21-212</sup> are followed by four incidents in 2<sup>13-36</sup> (the last of them a miracle) which bring out

## TO WHOM WAS THE SERMON ADDRESSED ? 49

teaching that provokes the criticism, and soon the hostility, of the Scribes and Pharisees.<sup>a</sup> And we shall see reason to suspect that some of the sayings recorded in Mark have been grouped together apart from the contexts to which historically they belong, very possibly because the occasions which gave rise to them have been forgotten. But, whatever deductions may have to be made in regard to minor matters of order, it seems highly probable that Mark presents a correct historical outline of at least the main events, and that the first chapters of his Gospel give a fairly accurate sketch of what actually preceded the Sermon in the Ministry of our Lord.

II. THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE SERMON WAS ADDRESSED.—In Lk. 6<sup>12-19</sup> there is mention of three classes as being in Christ's presence. First, there are His disciples in general, who are said to constitute a great multitude (ὄχλος πολὺς, Lk. 6<sup>17</sup>). Then, there are the Twelve, who have been selected (ἐκλεξάμενος, Lk. 6<sup>13</sup>) from this general body of adherents. Finally, mention is made of a great crowd of people (πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ), who are said to have come from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon. The same three classes are mentioned in Mk. 3<sup>7-19</sup>. Here the crowd is stated to have hailed from Galilee, Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon (Mk. 3<sup>7-8</sup>). Matthew also mentions great multitudes and says that they came from Galilee, Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judaea, and beyond Jordan (Mt. 4<sup>25</sup>).

In Lk. 6<sup>20</sup> the Sermon is introduced by the words, 'And He lifted up His eyes on His disciples, and said.' The 'disciples' here doubtless include the Twelve, but are not necessarily limited to them. The previous occurrence in Luke of the word μαθητῆς is in 6<sup>17</sup>, where it is applied to a great multitude. Here also the word may well denote the whole body of Christ's adherents present. But our Lord's audience seems to have been wider even than this, for in Lk. 7<sup>1</sup> we read, 'After He had ended all His sayings in the ears of the people (τοῦ λαοῦ) He entered into Capernaum,' and the word λαός is used in 6<sup>17</sup> of the great

<sup>a</sup> In Hastings' *D.B.*, Art. 'Chronology of N.T.,' vol. i. p. 406 f.

crowd. Lk. 7<sup>1</sup> is substantially, though not verbally, parallel to Mt. 7<sup>28a</sup>, and very possibly comes from the connecting link in Q between the Sermon and the healing of the centurion's servant. Thus, according to Luke, the hearers of the Sermon seem to have included each of the three classes above mentioned. With this Matthew agrees. In Mt. 5<sup>1-2</sup> we read, 'And seeing the multitudes, He went up into the mountain: and when He had sat down, His disciples came unto Him: and He opened His mouth, and taught them, saying.' It is possible that the clause, 'and when He had sat down, His disciples came unto Him,' is parenthetical, and that the αὐτοῦς of v. 2 refers back to the ὄχλους of v. 1. But it seems more probable that the reference of αὐτοῦς is to the μαθηταί. If so, the word μαθηταί here may be understood, either in the narrower sense of the Twelve, as usually in the First Gospel, or in the broader sense in which it is employed in Lk. 6<sup>17</sup>. In Mt. 7<sup>28-29</sup> we read, 'And it came to pass, when Jesus ended these words, the multitudes were astonished at His teaching: for He taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.' The same word ὄχλοι is here used as in Mt. 4<sup>25</sup> and 5<sup>1</sup>.

There seems to be no reason to doubt this testimony of the Evangelists, which not improbably derives from Q. The internal evidence of the Sermon supplements it, contributing an argument in favour of the Discourse having been mainly addressed to the Twelve. For the comparison of Christ's hearers in Mt. 5<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>26</sup> with the prophets of the old dispensation seems to suggest that they were to be prominent members of the new society, and the sayings about the Pearls and the Swine, and the Mote and the Beam in Mt. 7<sup>6</sup>, and Mt. 7<sup>3-5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>41-42</sup>, seem to be addressed to those who were to be Christian teachers.

As to what different sorts and conditions of men were included within the throng around them, we are largely left to conjecture. Since many had come to be healed of their diseases, both bodily and spiritual (Lk. 6<sup>18-19</sup>; cf. Mk. 3<sup>10-12</sup>, Mt. 4<sup>23-25</sup>), we may suppose that diversity was a feature of the crowd. It is remarkable that, at such a comparatively early stage of the Ministry, some should be stated to have come from the sea-coast of Tyre and

Sidon (Lk. 6<sup>17</sup> ; *cf.* Mk. 3<sup>8</sup>). This, as well as the mention of Decapolis in Mt. 4<sup>25</sup>, suggests that some Gentiles may have been included in the crowd. It is also quite possible that there were present some Hellenistic Jews, especially if the Sermon was delivered at about the time of the Feast of Pentecost. But the majority were probably Palestinian Jews. It is probable that there were present some strict members of the sect of the Pharisees, and that the bulk at least of the hearers were in sympathy with their faith and practice.<sup>a</sup>

So far as the Gospels tell us, the Twelve were drawn from the upper artisan class. Perhaps it was from the same class that the whole body of His adherents chiefly came. We also know that the Twelve were mostly Galilaeans (*cf.* Acts 1<sup>11</sup>, 2<sup>7</sup>). Probably the same was the case with the disciples generally. Perhaps the bulk of the crowd were Galilaeans also. Mk. 3<sup>7</sup> mentions Galilee first, and so does Mt. 4<sup>25</sup>. It is true that there is no mention of Galilee in Lk. 6<sup>17</sup>, but it is probable (as we have already noticed) that the phrase here, ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, refers, as in some other passages in Luke's writings, to the whole of the Roman Province of Judaea, which included lower Galilee. Our Lord's Ministry since the Baptist's imprisonment had been confined to Galilee (with the possible exception of the visit to Jerusalem of Jn. 5), and the indefinite expression εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Mk. 3<sup>13</sup>, Mt. 5<sup>1</sup>, Lk. 6<sup>12</sup>), which is all the information which our Evangelists afford as to the site of the Choice of the Twelve and of the delivery of the Sermon, probably refers to some eminence in Galilee not far from that part of the shore of the Lake to which our Lord withdrew with His Disciples after the plot against His life of the Pharisees and Herodians at Capernaum (Mk. 3<sup>7</sup>).<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Cf.* Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*, Introd., p. 71 : 'It is probably no exaggeration to say that five-sixths of the nation were Pharisaic more or less, though where and how the limits ran it is hard to say.'

<sup>b</sup> The traditional site is the 'Horns of Hattin,' some five miles from the western shore of the Lake. It may be the true site, but the tradition in regard to it does not go back beyond late Crusading times, and is unknown to the Eastern Church.



## MARK'S PARALLELS

Matter common to Mk. and Mt. underlined.  
Parallels in various Marcan texts.

- (1.) Καὶ περιῆγε τὰς κόμας κυκλῶ διδάσκων.  
 6<sup>6b</sup> Καὶ ἐισπορεύονται εἰς Καπερναοὺμ· καὶ  
 1 εὐθέως τοὺς σάββατον εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν εἰδίδασκε.  
 1<sup>39</sup> καὶ ἦλθε κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ τὰ δαίμονια ἐκβέλλων.  
 1<sup>14b</sup> . . . ἦλθον δ' ἰησοὺς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ.  
 1<sup>28</sup> ἐξῆλθε δὲ ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.  
 1<sup>32b</sup> . . . ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους.  
 1<sup>34a</sup> καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλως νόσους, . . .  
 5<sup>21</sup> καὶ ἀπῆλθε μετ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὅχλος πολὺς, καὶ συνέδρευον αὐτόν.

(2.) Parallels in Mark 3 7-19.

Καὶ δ' ἰησοὺς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησαν· καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὸιδουμαίας, καὶ πέραν Ἰάμβων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα, πλῆθος πολλὸν, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίη, ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πλοῦταιον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὅχλον, ἵνα μὴ θλιβῶσιν αὐτόν· πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε ἐπιπλήτειν αὐτῷ, ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀφῶνται, ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας. καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκαθάρατα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέειπεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζε λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ πολλὰ ἐπέτρεμα

## MATTHEW 4 23-5 2

Matter common to Mt. and Mk. underlined.  
Matter common to Mt. and Lk. in full capitals.

Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ.  
 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν· καὶ προσήρεγκαν αὐτῷ ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΚῶΣ ἔχοντας, ποικίλως ΝΟΣΟΙΣ καὶ βασάνοις συνεχομένους, δαιμονιζομένους καὶ σεδνηριζομένους καὶ παραλυτικούς· καὶ ἔΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΕΝ Αὐτούς.  
 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὈΧΛΟΙ ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ἈΠΟ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ ἸΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ καὶ ἸΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.  
 Ἰδὼν δὲ ΤΟΥΣ ὈΧΛΟΥΣ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Οἱ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ Αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ΛΕΙΓΩΝ, κ.τ.λ.

The above comparisons are intended to exhibit :—

- (1) The large extent to which the wording of Mt. 4 23-5 2 is paralleled in the different passages of Mark quoted under (1), viz. 36½ words out of a total in Matthew of 100 words.
- (2) The considerable extent to which the wording of Mt. 4 23-5 2 is paralleled in Mk. 3 7-12 (2)—viz. 27 words. (N.B. All the words in Mk. 3 7-12, which occur also in Matthew, have been underlined, including those which have been underlined in the previous passages quoted from Mark.)
- (3) The very large extent to which the wording of Mt. 4 23-5 2 is paralleled in the Marcan passages (1) and (2) taken together :—viz. 57 words.
- (4) The considerable extent to which the wording of Lk. 6 17-20 is paralleled in Mt. 4 23-5 2—viz. 31 words out of a total in Luke of 73 words.

## LUKE 6 17-20

Matter common to Lk. and Mt. in full capitals.

Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπον πεδινῷ, καὶ ὈΧΛΟΣ ΠΟΛΥΣ μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολλῶ του λαοῦ· αἰο πάσης τῆς ἸΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ καὶ ἸΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, ὅς ἦλθον ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ΝΟΣΩΝ αὐτοῦ.  
 καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλοῦμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἔΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΟΝΤΟ.  
 καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὈΧΛΟΣ ἐξήρει ἁπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ· ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο, καὶ ἰάτο ΠΑΝΤΑΣ.  
 καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς ΜΑΘΗΤΑΣ αὐτοῦ ἔΛΕΓΕ κ.τ.λ.

## CHAPTER V

THE SERMON MATTER PARALLELED IN MARK AND  
THE SERMON DOUBLETS

We now address ourselves to the task of reconstructing as nearly as possible the content and wording of the Sermon as it stood in Q.

It may help to clear the ground for our consideration of the main parts of the problem before us if we first turn our attention to two related matters of subsidiary importance : viz. the matter in the Sermons of the Evangelists which is paralleled in Mark ; and the matter which is paralleled by the same Evangelist in another context of his Gospel.

I. THE SERMON MATTER PARALLELED IN MARK.—Of the Matthaean Discourse eight passages are paralleled more or less closely in Mark, viz. Mt. 5<sup>13a</sup> = Mk. 9<sup>50a</sup> ; Mt. 5<sup>15</sup> = Mk. 4<sup>21</sup> ; Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> = Mk. 9<sup>43-48</sup> ; Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Mk. 10<sup>11-12</sup> ; Mt. 6<sup>14-15</sup> = Mk. 11<sup>25</sup> ; Mt. 6<sup>33b</sup> = Mk. 4<sup>24c</sup> ; Mt. 7<sup>2b</sup> = Mk. 4<sup>24b</sup> ; and Mt. 7<sup>7a</sup> = Mk. 11<sup>24b</sup>. Luke's Discourse has but one parallel to these Matthaean passages, viz. Lk. 6<sup>38c</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>2b</sup>, and this is all the parallelism with Mark contained in his Discourse. The question which we have to consider is whether or not in any of these instances our First Evangelist has drawn matter from Mark, and inserted it from other contexts into the Sermon. We shall see reason for thinking that this is not the case. Let us examine the passages severally.

(1) Mt. 5<sup>13a</sup> = Mk. 9<sup>50a</sup> (the savourless Salt).

Neither Matthew nor Luke reproduces this verse in the Marcan context. Matthew has it only in the Sermon, and Luke only in 14<sup>34</sup>, at the close of a passage setting forth

the cost of discipleship. But Matthew and Luke not only agree against Mark in placing the saying in contexts other than his, but also in several details. They both read *μωρανθη* in place of Mark's *ἀναλον γένηται*, omit *αὐτό*, have the passive instead of the active form of the verb in the next clause, and follow it by a clause setting forth the uselessness of savourless salt. Matthew's version exhibits two further departures from Mark, viz. *ὁμοῖς ἐστε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς* instead of *καλὸν τὸ ἅλας*, and the use of the verb *ἀλίζειν* instead of Mark's *ἀρτύειν*. But these latter look like compiler's changes. Probably Matthew has altered the beginning of the saying in order to make it fit the context in which he places it. It is possible that the use of *ἁλισθήσεται* in Mk. 9<sup>49</sup> has influenced Matthew's use of this word in place of Luke's *ἀρτυθήσεται*, assuming the latter to have been in Q, but the influence of Mark, if present at all, seems to have been but slight. The facts point to the saying having stood in Q, and to Matthew having taken it from its context in Q and fitted it into the Sermon.

(2) Mt. 5<sup>15</sup> = Mk. 4<sup>21</sup> (the Lamp and the Bushel).

The saying appears here only in Matthew, but Luke has it in the Marcan context in 8<sup>16</sup> and in a different context in 11<sup>33</sup>. This suggests that it stood in Q as well as in Mark. It is true that the wording of the two members of the Lucan doublet does not in this case afford any appreciable corroborative evidence, for it is strikingly similar in both members, and the first shows little indication of being drawn from Mark, or the second of deriving from the same source as Mt. 5<sup>15</sup>. But that Luke has nevertheless drawn from Mark in the first member, and from Q in the second, is supported by his parallels to the next verse of Mark, viz. 4<sup>22</sup>. These constitute another doublet, and the first member, Lk. 8<sup>17</sup>, is very similar in wording to Mark, whilst the second member, Lk. 12<sup>2</sup>, has close verbal agreements with Mt. 10<sup>26</sup>. Accepting then the derivation of Lk. 11<sup>33</sup> from Q, the agreements of Matthew with Luke against or besides Mark's version point to his having drawn the saying from Q and not from Mark. They are chiefly

these:—Whilst in Mark the saying is cast into an interrogative form, Matthew agrees with Luke in giving it in the form of a statement. He also agrees with Luke in giving a reason for the lamp being placed on the stand. Though the wording is here different, the idea is similar. It seems probable that Matthew has modified the beginning and the ending of the saying as he found it in Q, in order to adapt it to the context in which he places it. His version appears to show no trace of Marcan influence.

(3) Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> = Mk. 9<sup>43-48</sup> ('If thy right eye, etc., offend thee').

This passage nowhere appears in Luke. Thus we are deprived of an important criterion as to source derivation. But in Matthew the passage appears in the Marcan context as well as here. This fact suggests that it stood in another source besides Mark, and that Matthew is here reproducing that other source. And this supposition is strengthened by two considerations, viz. (i) the considerable differences in content and order between Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> and both Mk. 9<sup>43-48</sup> and its parallel in Mt. 18<sup>8-9</sup>. Whilst the latter agree in mentioning the hand first and the eye last, the Sermon passage mentions the eye first and the hand afterwards. This difference may be ascribed to the compiler rather than to his source, for the inversion of order makes the passage follow the preceding verses more naturally. But the differences of content are not so naturally assigned to the compiler, especially the occurrence in both verses of Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> of more general phrases in contrast to the particularisation in the Marcan version of the physical sacrifices enjoined, and the addition in these verses of the word δεξιὰ (Mt. 5<sup>29</sup> and 30): (ii) the intelligibility of the omission by Luke of this passage, assuming that it stood in Q. He has omitted it from Mark, and may well have done the same when he came across it in his Q source. The metaphor of amputation might seem to him liable to misunderstanding by Gentile readers.

(4) Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Mk. 10<sup>11-12</sup> (the sinfulness of Divorce).

The Marcan matter is partly paralleled by Matthew in the Marcan context (Mt. 19<sup>9</sup>). As Matthew is there



drawing from Mark, it is probable that he is here using another source. That this source is Q is probable because (i) Luke, who omits this section of Mark, has parallel matter in 16<sup>18</sup> after two verses of Q. (ii) Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> agrees in several particulars with Lk. 16<sup>18</sup> against Mk. 10<sup>11-12</sup> and Mt. 19<sup>9</sup>; cf. especially  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$  in place of  $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta$ , and, if we may retain the last six words of the Matthaean version, in the reference of the last clause to the man who marries the divorced woman, instead of to the divorced woman herself. Is there any trace of Marcan influence in Mt. 5<sup>32</sup>? Matthew has  $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota} \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu \mu\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$  in place of Luke's  $\mu\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$ . It is conceivable that Matthew has here been influenced by Mark's  $\mu\omicron\iota\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi' \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ . If so, this is the only trace of Marcan influence.

(6) and (7) Mt. 6<sup>33b</sup>, 7<sup>2b</sup> = Mk. 4<sup>24b & c</sup> ('With what measure ye mete,' etc.)

The fact that Luke has this saying in the midst of Q matter, and in his report of the Sermon (6<sup>38b</sup>), seems conclusive that it stood in Q, and in Q's Sermon. Neither Matthew nor Luke has it in the Marcan context. Canon Streeter's suggestion<sup>a</sup> that Mark's addition of  $\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  may be a reminiscence of the words in a different context of Q would seem to have more in its favour if we could accept the Matthaean order of Q in preference to the Lucan. The saying does not appear in Luke until we reach 12<sup>31</sup>. As both the Matthaean parallels to Mark's next verse (viz. Mt. 13<sup>12</sup>, 25<sup>29</sup>) add  $\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , it may be that it is from here that the added words derive which he or Mark has appended to the saying of 4<sup>24</sup>. In any case there seems no question of Matthew having borrowed from Mark.

(8) Mt. 7<sup>7a</sup> = Mk. 11<sup>24b</sup> ('Ask, and it shall be given you').

The parallelism is so slight that the passage is only worth recording for the sake of completeness. Matthew is clearly drawing from Q alone. He has a parallel to Mk. 11<sup>24</sup>, though not an exact one, in 21<sup>22</sup>. The words of Mt. 7<sup>7a</sup>,  $\text{Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν}$ , are exactly reproduced in Lk. 11<sup>9</sup>, and form the beginning of a long Q section.

<sup>a</sup> *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 172.



(5) Mt. 6<sup>1-15</sup> = Mk. 11<sup>25</sup> (with much variation) (forgiveness of Enemies).

We have left this instance to the last because of its difficulty. The facts are briefly these. Mk. 11<sup>25</sup> is the last verse in Mark's account of some words of Christ consequent upon the withering of the fig tree. Matthew omits the verse, although he reproduces the preceding verses in the Marcan context of his Gospel. Luke, who has recorded a parable about a Barren Fig Tree in 13<sup>6-9</sup>, omits both the miracle and the discourse which takes its rise from it. Mt. 6<sup>14-15</sup> follows immediately upon the Lord's Prayer. It has no parallel in any part of Luke. Thus we are here reduced to the evidence afforded by the two passages in question and their contexts. Mk. 11<sup>26</sup> is clearly an interpolation from Matthew.\* Omitting this verse, the parallelism between the two passages is considerably reduced. But it still remains remarkable and significant. Mark here reads ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, while Matthew has ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος. In only three other passages, viz. Mk. 8<sup>38</sup>, 13<sup>32</sup>, 14<sup>36</sup>, does Mark use the word πατήρ of God, and the expression 'heavenly Father,' which occurs so frequently in Matthew, is found here only in Mark. Still more striking is the fact that the word παράπτωμα is found nowhere else in the Gospels outside these two passages. This parallelism argues literary dependence and points to one or other of two alternatives: either that Matthew has borrowed here from Mark, or that Mark derives from the same source as Matthew. The latter appears to be the true explanation, for (i) it does not seem likely that Mark would have used the expression ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς unless he took it from his source. As this synonym for God occurs several times in the parts of Matthew which derive from Q, we have a satisfactory explanation of its occurrence in Mark if Q were here the source both of Matthew and of Mark. Then, (ii), Mt. 6<sup>15</sup> is not represented in Mark's true text, and cannot be derived from him. It seems more probable to suppose that Matthew found it in his source than that he

\* The verse is omitted by  $\aleph$  B k l Syr<sup>Sin</sup>, etc.

added it himself. If the saying stood in Q as he gives it, and if Mark is drawing from Q, he has omitted the latter half. This is what he has done elsewhere—*e.g.* in the saying about the Lamp and the Stand discussed above, where he omits the conclusion stating the purpose of the lamp; and in 4<sup>22</sup>, where he gives only the first member of an antithetical pair of sayings which we have in Mt. 10<sup>26-27</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>2-3</sup>. Indeed, assuming that Mark drew from a Q saying which is preserved in Mt. 6<sup>14-15</sup>, we might call his treatment of it characteristic. (iii) But, further, there is evidence that the matter of Mk. 11<sup>22-23</sup> was paralleled in Q, and it seems probable that Mark may here also be drawing from Q. For Mt. 21<sup>21</sup>, which is parallel to Mk. 11<sup>22-23</sup>, has already appeared in Mt. 18<sup>20</sup>. Luke has a parallel in a third context, viz. 17<sup>6</sup>, and Mt. 17<sup>20</sup> and Lk. 17<sup>6</sup> agree against Mark in having ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως.

We therefore conclude that in none of the eight instances where Sermon matter is paralleled in Mark have the Evangelists drawn upon Mark for it. In the critical discussion of the following pages, we shall accordingly leave Mark out of account as a possible source for any of the Sermon matter. It follows from this conclusion that the fact of Sermon matter being paralleled in Mark constitutes no argument against its being drawn from Q. It is interesting in this connexion to notice that five of the passages which we have examined occur in two sections of Mark (viz. 4<sup>21-25</sup> and 9<sup>43-50</sup>) which contain peculiarly disconnected and Q-like sayings.

II. THE DOUBLETS.—We now turn to the doublets. There are four passages in Mt. 5-7 which are paralleled elsewhere in the First Gospel, viz. Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>8-9</sup>; Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>9</sup>; Mt. 7<sup>16-18</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>33-35</sup>; and Mt. 7<sup>19</sup> = Mt. 3<sup>10</sup>. None of the matter in Lk. 6<sup>20-49</sup> is paralleled elsewhere in his Gospel.

(1) and (2) Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>8-9</sup> (the Right Eye and the Right Hand). Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>9</sup> (on Divorce).

Of the four Matthaean doublets, we have already considered the first two in the present chapter. As we have seen, they seem to owe their existence to the use by

Matthew of similar matter contained in two sources, viz. Mark and Q. We have found in them support for the view that Matthew used Q in the member which occurs in the Sermon, and Mark in the other member.

(3) Mt. 7<sup>16-18</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>33-35</sup> (the Tree known by its Fruits).

The third and fourth doublets are different. They are not paralleled in Mark. We will consider them separately.

The only parallel in Luke to both members of the third is Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup>. What we have to ask is, whether Luke has conflated two similar passages, or whether Matthew has separated matter which stood together in one passage of Q. It is not Luke's custom to conflate. On the other hand, there are several instances in which Matthew seems to have used twice over matter derived from the same passage. Mt. 10<sup>17-22</sup> and 24<sup>9-14</sup> both appear to be drawn from Mk. 13<sup>9-13</sup>, and there is some reason for thinking that Mt. 9<sup>27-31</sup> as well as 20<sup>29-34</sup> may be taken from Mk. 10<sup>46-52</sup>. So, too, the doublets Mt. 9<sup>32-34</sup> = 12<sup>22-24</sup> and Mt. 10<sup>15</sup> = 11<sup>24</sup> seem to be drawn from the same Q passages; and Mt. 9<sup>13</sup> = 12<sup>7</sup> and Mt. 16<sup>19</sup> = 18<sup>18</sup> from the same passages, either of Q or of some other source. It seems probable, therefore, that Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup> stood together in Q, and that Matthew has assigned part of it to the Sermon and part to the Beelzebub Discourse. The probability of this is strengthened by the fact that there is no parallel to Lk. 6<sup>45</sup> in Mt. 7<sup>16-18</sup>, and that the matter of this verse might well seem to the compiler to attach itself naturally to the Beelzebub Discourse. But if Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup> stood together in Q, it probably stood in the Sermon of Q, where Luke places it. Mt. 12<sup>33-35</sup> is indeed much the closer parallel to it, for it has 35 words, or parts of words, identical with it, whilst Mt. 7<sup>16-18</sup> has but 15. But Matthew has elsewhere placed the closer parallel to his source in the new context in which he has inserted it; cf. Mt. 10<sup>17-22</sup> and 24<sup>9-14</sup> with Mk. 13<sup>9-13</sup> and Mt. 9<sup>32-34</sup> = 12<sup>22-24</sup> with Lk. 11<sup>14-15</sup>.

(4) Mt. 7<sup>19</sup> = Mt. 3<sup>10</sup> (the Burning of profitless Trees).

The only Lucan parallel to the remaining doublet is Lk. 3<sup>9</sup>. Here, too, it looks as if Matthew had used the same material twice over. The passage certainly stood in Q's account of the Baptist's preaching. The report of the words in Matthew and Luke agrees as to context, and is identical in wording. It is intelligible that the similarity of the figure, and the theme in our Lord's words in the Sermon, may have suggested to the compiler the insertion of the passage at this point. In Mt. 15<sup>13</sup> we find a similar saying interpolated into discourse matter drawn from Mark. On the other hand, if Mt. 7<sup>19</sup> occurred in Q's Sermon, it seems probable that Luke would have recorded it. We shall see reason later to think that Mt. 7<sup>15-20</sup> bears other traces of the compiler's hand.

## CHAPTER VI

THE MATTER COMMON TO THE TWO REPORTS OF THE SERMON  
AND THE MATTER IN THE SERMON OF THE ONE EVAN-  
GELIST WHICH IS PLACED IN OTHER CONTEXTS BY THE  
OTHER.

I. THE MATTER COMMON TO THE TWO REPORTS OF THE  
SERMON.—Taking the Lucan order, this is as follows—

Lk. 6<sup>20b-23</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>3, 4, 6, 11-12</sup> (Beatitudes).

Lk. 6<sup>27a, 28b, 29-30, 31, 32-33, 35b, 36</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>44, 39b, 40, 42, 7<sup>12</sup>, 5<sup>46-47, 45, 48</sup></sup> (Love to Enemies, and Non-Resistance).

Lk. 6<sup>37a, 38b</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>1, 2b</sup> (Warning against judging others).

Lk. 6<sup>41-42</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>3-5</sup> (the Mote and the Beam).

Lk. 6<sup>43-44</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>16, 18</sup> (the good and the bad Tree).

Lk. 6<sup>46-49</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>21, 24-27</sup> (Warning against Profession apart from Practice).

Our discussion in the first chapter of the non-Marcian matter common to Matthew and Luke led us to regard this matter as drawn by both Evangelists from Q, except in cases where the divergences between the parallel matter are such as to make it appear unlikely that they are due to changes made by the Evangelists in the text of the same documentary source. Are there any such cases in the parallel matter of the Sermon?

Comparing Matthew and Luke, we find that they agree most closely in the sayings about the Mote and the Beam. Here the two reports are almost verbally identical. In the rest of the matter the parallelism is fairly close. Sir John Hawkins has arranged the parallel matter of Matthew and Luke apart from Mark in three classes, according to the degree of probability of its derivation in his judgement



from Q.<sup>a</sup> He places all the parallel Sermon matter in Class A, except the Beatitudes, Mt. 5<sup>3, 4, 6</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>20b, 21</sup>, and the verse which contrasts saying 'Lord, Lord,' with doing, viz. Mt. 7<sup>21</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>46</sup>, which he places in Class B. The doubtfulness of a common derivation from Q is probably greatest in the case of the Beatitudes. This is due to the added Beatitudes of Matthew and the added Woes of Luke, as well as to the differences between the text of the Beatitudes common to the two reports. Do the divergences here point to the use by Matthew and Luke of different sources?

(1) An hypothesis which naturally suggests itself is that Matthew is following Q, whilst Luke is drawing from some other source. This might be combined with the view that Luke has drawn from some source other than Q for the preceding accounts of the Visit to Nazareth in 4<sup>16-30</sup>, and of the Call of Simon in 5<sup>1-11</sup>. Luke, it might be supposed, has continued to follow his special source for the Beatitudes and Woes, only then turning to his Q source, which he seems to have followed for the rest of the Sermon. In support of this view, other Lucan passages which exhibit a similar degree of divergence from Matthew, and notably the Lord's Prayer, might be adduced.

(2) Another hypothesis is, that Luke has faithfully followed Q, whilst Matthew has conflated the Sermon matter of Q with sayings drawn from other sources, or from elsewhere in Q. We have good evidence that, in other instances, Matthew has compiled his materials in this sort of way.

(3) A third view is that, in spite of their differences, both Matthew and Luke have drawn from Q.

It is not easy to make up one's mind as to where the balance of probability lies. On the whole, we incline to the last hypothesis. It has in its favour the considerable degree of similarity between Mt. 5<sup>11, 12</sup>, and Lk. 6<sup>22, 23</sup>. Also, if the original text of Q was such as that we have reconstructed in Chapter VIII, it does not seem unintelligible that the versions of Matthew and Luke should have been the result of their independent modifications of that text.

<sup>a</sup> *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 113 ff.

Nor, as will appear from our discussion in Chapter VII, do their divergences as regards the number of the Beatitudes and the inclusion of the Woes seem to be incapable of being accounted for on this hypothesis.

But if, to the reader's mind, the differences between the two accounts of the Beatitudes are too great for their derivation from the same source to appear probable, his view of the nearest approach that we can make to the actual words of our Lord will still probably not differ very materially from ours. No doubt he will take a somewhat different view of what was the original text of Q; but many of the arguments which, on the assumption that Matthew and Luke draw from the same documentary source, go to show what was the original form of that source, on the assumption that our Evangelists drew from different documents, point us to what were the words actually used by our Lord. And it is this the attainment of which is of real consequence. Only in so far as the attempt to reconstruct the original Q text is a contribution towards the recovery of the *ipsissima verba* of Christ, has it real importance.

There is another question to be considered. Granted that the parallel matter in the two reports of the Sermon derives from Q, does it follow that it derives from Q's record of the Sermon? It is conceivable that Q contained no record of a Sermon at all. The suggestion has been made that Matthew and Luke may have culled sayings from various parts of Q, and have independently arranged them in a similar order. Their having done this can be explained on the supposition that there was a tradition, current in the early Church and known to both our Evangelists, as to the subjects with which our Lord dealt in His first great Discourse. We recognise that this is possible; but it seems to us far-fetched and improbable. That Matthew might so treat his material is not inconceivable, but it is out of harmony with all we know of Luke's literary methods to suppose that he has compiled in this manner.

## 64 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

II. THE MATTER IN THE SERMON OF THE ONE EVANGELIST, WHICH IS PLACED IN OTHER CONTEXTS BY THE OTHER.  
 —There are fourteen passages in Matthew's Sermon which Luke assigns to other contexts, and four passages in Luke's Sermon which Matthew assigns to other contexts.

A. The passages in Matthew's Sermon are as follows :

Mt. 5<sup>13</sup> = Lk. 14<sup>34-35</sup> (with variations). Saying concerning Salt.

Mt. 5<sup>15</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>33</sup> (8<sup>16</sup>). The Lamp and Stand.

Mt. 5<sup>18</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>17</sup>. The Permanence of the Law.

Mt. 5<sup>25-26</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>58-59</sup>. The Duty of Reconciliation with an Adversary.

Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>18</sup>. Saying concerning Divorce. (Luke omits 'saving for the cause of fornication.')

Mt. 6<sup>9-13</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>2-4</sup> (with variations). The Lord's Prayer.

Mt. 6<sup>19-21</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>33-34</sup> (with much difference). Laying up Treasure in Heaven.

Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>34-35</sup> (Luke adds 11<sup>36</sup>, 'If therefore thy whole body be full of light,' etc.) The single and the evil Eye.

Mt. 6<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>13</sup>. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.

Mt. 6<sup>25-33</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>22-31</sup> (with variations). Against Anxiety for the Supply of bodily Needs.

Mt. 7<sup>7-11</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>9-13</sup>. Exhortation to Prayer.

Mt. 7<sup>13-14</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>23-24</sup> (with variations). Exhortation to enter through the narrow Gate (Lk., Door).

Mt. 7<sup>19</sup> = Lk. 3<sup>9</sup>. The Burning of profitless Trees.

Mt. 7<sup>22-23</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>25-27</sup> (with great variations). The Rejection of professing Christians.

B. The passages in Luke's Sermon are as follows :

Lk. 6<sup>39b</sup> = Mt. 15<sup>14b</sup>. The Peril of blind Guides.

Lk. 6<sup>40</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>24-25</sup>. The Disciple not above his Master.

Lk. 6<sup>43-44a</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>33</sup>. The Tree known by its Fruit.

Lk. 6<sup>45</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>34b-35</sup>. The Treasure of the Heart.

## MATTER PLACED ELSEWHERE IN LUKE 65

The preliminary question in regard to this matter which demands consideration is whether the parallelism between Matthew and Luke is in all cases sufficient to make it appear probable that both Evangelists have drawn it from Q. We have already considered four of the passages of Matthew, in connexion with the matter paralleled in Mark and the doublets, viz. Mt. 5<sup>13, 15, 32</sup>, 7<sup>19</sup>. Each of these seemed, on examination, to derive from Q. Of the remaining ten passages of Matthew, Sir John Hawkins places eight in his Class A; also Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup>. The other passages, viz. Mt. 7<sup>13-14, 22-23</sup>, and Lk. 6<sup>39b, 40</sup>, he places in Class B.<sup>a</sup> And, on examination, in each case the probability of these passages with their Lucan parallels deriving from a common written source seems—in spite of much difference of wording—to be fairly considerable. In the case of the Lord's Prayer, whilst there is striking agreement in the occurrence in both versions of the word ἐπιούσιος, there are also remarkable differences. On the whole, as with the Beatitudes, the balance of probability seems to be in favour of a common derivation from Q. Matthew's enlargements of the Prayer may be due, at least in part, to its early liturgical use.

We shall therefore proceed on the assumption that it is from Q that all this parallel matter has been drawn by the Evangelists.

A. *The Matthaean Passages*.—In general, it may be said that the arguments which we adduced in Chapter II for preferring the Lucan order of Q apply with full force to these Sermon passages. Matthew's Discourse has every appearance of being a compilation. It is the first of his great compendia of topically ordered matter, and, with the exception of the last (if we include in it Mt. 23), the longest. We know that he has rearranged matter drawn from Mark in cc. 8-9, and there is no reason to suppose that he has acted differently in regard to the matter which he has drawn from Q in cc. 5-7.

Turning now to examine the passages in detail, it will be convenient to consider first the cases where the particular evidence seems to afford strong corroboration of the Lucan context.

<sup>a</sup> *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 113 ff.



(1) Mt. 6<sup>9-13</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>2-4</sup> (the Lord's Prayer).

Here the Lucan context is supported by (a) the fact that in Luke the Prayer is represented as having been given in response to a request by one of Christ's disciples on a particular occasion. It seems probable that in Q the Prayer stood with an introduction as in Lk. 11<sup>1-4</sup>. (b) The fact that in Matthew the Prayer has every appearance of being an interpolation. It spoils the symmetry and balance of the three illustrations of ostentatious righteousness in Mt. 6<sup>1-18</sup>. (c) The easy intelligibility of the supposition that the Prayer would suggest itself to the compiler of our First Gospel for insertion at this point.

(2) Mt. 6<sup>25-33</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>22-31</sup> (against Anxiety for the Supply of bodily Needs).

There is much in this passage which seems to refer to the Parable of the Rich Fool, which precedes it in the Lucan context; e.g. with ψυχῇ and φάγητε in Lk. 12<sup>22</sup> we may compare ψυχὴ and φάγε in 12<sup>19</sup>. Lk. 12<sup>23</sup> (the life is more than the food, etc.) may refer back to 12<sup>15</sup> (a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth), although, in the latter, ζωή is the word used, whilst in 12<sup>23</sup> we have ψυχή.

If we admit the connexion it may explain the philosophical turn of the warning; σπείρουσιν and θερίζουσιν in 12<sup>24</sup> may refer to the ground of the rich man which brought forth plentifully (12<sup>16</sup>), and ταμεῖον and ἀποθήκη to the ἀποθήκης of 12<sup>18</sup>; also ἡλικία in 12<sup>25</sup>, if translated 'age,' may refer to the rich man's failure to prolong his life. If we may translate μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε in 12<sup>29</sup> 'be not uplifted,' it may refer to the rich fool, who was uplifted in that he sought for what was lofty in his own eyes. There is also logical connexion between the two passages, for an exhortation to trust in God's fatherly care follows naturally on a warning against covetousness. Assuming such a connexion, διὰ τοῦτο in Lk. 12<sup>22</sup> will mean 'Because life does not depend on riches.'

(3) Mt. 6<sup>19-21</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>33-34</sup> (on laying up Treasure).

The above considerations apply to Mt. 6<sup>19-21</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>33-34</sup>, in so far as there is good reason to regard



## MATTER PLACED ELSEWHERE IN LUKE 67

these verses of Luke as belonging to the same section of Q as the preceding. And they do read like the conclusion and climax of one of the more continuous and coherent passages of Q. The thought of the Kingdom, introduced in v. 31, is uppermost in the remaining three verses, and the heavenly treasure of which they speak contrasts with the fool's treasure of worldly goods. The fact that Matthew places together before the long passage which is paralleled in Luke three short sayings which Luke assigns to three different contexts makes it highly improbable that the first of these, viz. 6<sup>19-21</sup>, stands in its true Q position. It also tells against Matthew's placing of the other two, viz.—

- (4) Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>34-35</sup> (the single and the evil Eye) and
- (5) Mt. 6<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>13</sup> (no man can serve two Masters).

That Matthew is here compiling is supported by the fact that, whilst in Matthew no connexion is apparent between these two with each other, or between either with its context, in Luke at least a verbal connexion appears in both cases with the preceding matter. For Lk. 11<sup>34-35</sup> has in common with 11<sup>33</sup> the word *λύχνος*, and the ideas of light and darkness; whilst Lk. 16<sup>13</sup> seems to owe its position to the occurrence of the words *μαμωνᾶ* and *κύριος* in the preceding parable, and to the correspondence between *οἰκέτης* here and the word *οἰκονόμος* of the parable. Such verbal and artificial links between sayings lacking deeper connexion may well derive from the arrangement of Q itself.

- (6) Mt. 7<sup>7-11</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>9-13</sup> (exhortation to Prayer).

It is not improbable that the parable of the Friend at Midnight (Lk. 11<sup>5-8</sup>) is from Q. Indeed, it may be said to suggest, by the interrogative form in which it is cast, and by its brevity and general character, the same source origin as the Q parable of the Lost Sheep. Matthew may have omitted it, though finding it in his source, because it might seem to teach that God needs to be importuned in order that unwillingness on His part to grant human petitions may be overcome. If this is so, Lk. 11<sup>1-13</sup> is a solid block of Q, and 11<sup>9-10</sup> stood in Q as Christ's application of the parable.

The parallelism between the parable and the interrogative parabolic sayings of 11<sup>11-13</sup>, as well as the very natural sequence of the whole passage, confirm this view. Mt. 7<sup>7-11</sup>, on the contrary, has no natural thought connexion with its context on either side.

(7) Mt. 7<sup>13-14</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>23-24</sup> (exhortation to enter through the narrow Gate; Lk., Door).

Here, as in the case of the Lord's Prayer, the Lucan placing is supported by the introduction which Luke gives in vv. 22 and 23. It is very probable that the saying stood in Q in the setting in which Luke records it. Moreover, that Matthew is here compiling appears from the fact that he separates Lk. 13<sup>23-24</sup> from the following verses, for Lk. 13<sup>25-27</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>22-23</sup>. We will consider this passage next.

(8) Mt. 7<sup>22-23</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>25-27</sup> (the Rejection of professing Christians).

The sequence in the whole of Lk. 13<sup>22-30</sup> is so natural that there seems little room for doubt that it is taken *en bloc* from Q. We have further evidence of compilation on Matthew's part from this Q section in the fact that he appends Lk. 13<sup>28-29</sup> to the account of Christ's words respecting the centurion of Capernaum (Mt. 8<sup>10-12</sup>).

(9) Mt. 5<sup>18</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>17</sup> (the Permanence of the Law) and  
(10) Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>18</sup> (saying concerning Divorce).

Sir John Hawkins has suggested \* that the explanation of the juxtaposition of these sayings in Luke is that Luke knew them as part of a discourse of Q such as Matthew records in 5<sup>17-48</sup>. This discourse would probably form part of the Sermon, for some of it stands in Luke's Sermon, viz. the substance of Mt. 5<sup>38-48</sup>. In this case we shall have to suppose that Luke found in Q's Sermon at least a large part of Mt. 5<sup>17-48</sup>, and that he recorded a portion of this matter, and omitted the rest, except that he brought together Mt. 5<sup>18 & 32</sup> in Lk. 16<sup>17 & 18</sup>, and also placed

\* *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 133.

## MATTER PLACED ELSEWHERE IN LUKE 69

Mt. 5<sup>25-26</sup> in Lk. 12<sup>58-59</sup> — *i.e.* if we assume that this latter passage was in Q's Discourse.

(11) Mt. 5<sup>25-26</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>58-59</sup> (on Reconciliation with an Adversary).

But, granting that Q contained a large part of Mt. 5<sup>17-48</sup> in its record of the Sermon, it is far more in accordance with the general procedure of the two Evangelists to suppose that Matthew has inserted into that Discourse matter from other contexts of Q. There seems to be no intelligible reason why Luke should not have located all that he retained of this Discourse in the context in which he found it. Moreover, both Mt. 5<sup>25-26</sup> and 5<sup>32</sup> have the appearance of being insertions into the Q narrative; and, if we regard 5<sup>31-32</sup> as included in the second section relating to the seventh Commandment rather than as constituting a separate third illustration, both occur at the close of the section to which they belong. Of the whole of the section Mt. 5<sup>17-48</sup>, the saying about the permanence of the Jewish Law (Mt. 5<sup>18</sup>) is the one we might most have expected Luke to omit. It stands by itself in the double tradition of Matthew and Luke. It seems very improbable that, whilst omitting so much of this section, Luke would have selected for retention this particular saying. And it seems impossible to suppose that Luke has brought together three verses, viz. Lk. 16<sup>16-18</sup>, one from the Discourse on the Baptist, the others from two different contexts of the Sermon, and at the same time to retain our belief in his fidelity elsewhere to the order and arrangement of Q. On the other hand, it is not unintelligible that Matthew should have located them in such Discourse contexts as their subject-matter suggested to him as appropriate.

(12) Mt. 5<sup>15</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>33</sup> (the Lamp and Stand).

Of this saying, also, we may say that the placing by Luke is hard to account for unless he found it in Q after the section relating to the Queen of the South and the Men of Nineveh. Its logical connexion with the preceding matter is not apparent, and therefore its placing is not likely to be editorial.

- (13) Mt. 5<sup>13</sup> = Lk. 14<sup>34-35</sup> (saying concerning Salt) and  
 (14) Mt. 7<sup>19</sup> = Lk. 3<sup>9</sup> (burning of the profitless Trees).

With regard to these, the two remaining passages, there does not seem to be much particular evidence. The latter we have already considered (see p. 60). As to the former, it is doubtful whether the preceding matter in Luke, viz. the Tower Builder and the King making War, is from Q or from some other source. If it is from Q, probably Luke has preserved the context of this passage; if it is not, probably the passage followed in Q after the last extract from that source which Luke has made. It would naturally follow v. 27.

B. *The Lucan Passages*.—The alternatives between which we have to choose are these:—either Luke has inserted into the Sermon matter from elsewhere, or Matthew has taken matter out of Q's Sermon and placed it in other contexts. *A priori* it might seem unlikely that Matthew would omit from his compilation any matter which he found in the Sermon of Q. But the analogy of his use of Mark shows that he sometimes omits, or transfers to other contexts, matter in his source of the same kind as that which he is compiling. In his collection of ten miracles in cc. 8 and 9, whilst he adds to the matter in Mk. 1-3 from elsewhere in Mark and from Q, he entirely omits the healing of the man with the unclean spirit of Mk. 1<sup>23-28</sup>, and postpones to his twelfth chapter the cure of the man with the withered hand of Mk. 3<sup>1-6</sup>. He may therefore have acted similarly in regard to some of the Q matter which he found in the Sermon.

A detailed examination of the Lucan passages seems to show that there is probability of his having done so.

The last two of these, viz.—

- (1) Lk. 6<sup>43-44a</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>33</sup> (the Tree known by its Fruit),  
 (2) Lk. 6<sup>45</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>34b-35</sup> (the Treasure of the Heart),  
 we have already considered, in treating of the Matthaean doublets (see p. 59). We have concluded them to be original to Q's Discourse.

There seems to be no good reason for thinking otherwise concerning the other two, viz.—

- (3) Lk. 6<sup>39b</sup> = Mt. 15<sup>14b</sup> (the Peril of blind Guides)
- (4) Lk. 6<sup>40</sup> = Mt. 10<sup>24-25</sup> (the Disciple not above his Master).

Mt. 15<sup>12-14</sup> is clearly an insertion into Mk. 7<sup>1-23</sup>, for there is nothing to indicate that Matthew had any other source besides Mark upon which to draw for the rest of 15<sup>1-20</sup>. Mt. 10 bears manifest evidence of being a compilation. Also, it seems necessary on internal grounds to postulate intervening matter in the historical Sermon between Mt. 7<sup>1-2</sup> and Mt. 7<sup>3-5</sup>. The latter passage represents the man who regards his neighbour's tiny fault as labouring under a huge one of his own. But there is no hint in Mt. 7<sup>1-2</sup> that those who condemn others are generally themselves great sinners. Lk. 6<sup>39b-40</sup> introduces a fresh though related topic.

It is possible that sayings similar to these occurred in more than one part of Q. But, whether this is the case or not, it is far more in line with the general procedure of the two Evangelists to suppose that Luke has retained them as they stood in Q's Sermon, and that Matthew has omitted them, as having them in different contexts, than to suppose that Luke has inserted them into the Sermon from different contexts of Q.

We are therefore led to accept as original to the Sermon of Q all the Q matter which Luke places in it, and to reject from it all the Q matter which Matthew includes in it, but which Luke assigns to different contexts.



# THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

## CHAPTER VII

THE MATTER IN THE SERMON OF THE ONE EVANGELIST WHICH  
THE OTHER NOWHERE RECORDS

THIS is as follows:—

I. In Matthew:

5<sup>5, 7, 8, 9, 10</sup> (Beatitudes).

5<sup>14</sup> (Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid).

5<sup>16</sup> (Even so let your light shine).

5<sup>17</sup> (Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets).

5<sup>19</sup> (Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments).

5<sup>20</sup> (Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees).

5<sup>21-22</sup> (Every one who is angry with his brother).

5<sup>23-24</sup> (If thou art offering thy gift at the altar).

5<sup>27-28</sup> (Every one that looketh on a woman).

5<sup>29-30</sup> (If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble).

5<sup>31</sup> (It was said, Whosoever shall put away his wife).

5<sup>33-37</sup> (Swear not at all).

5<sup>38-39<sup>a</sup></sup> (Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye).

5<sup>41</sup> (Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile).

5<sup>43</sup> (Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour).

6<sup>1-8, 14-18</sup> (On Almsgiving, Prayer and Fasting).

6<sup>34</sup> (Be not therefore anxious for the morrow).

7<sup>2<sup>a</sup></sup> (With what judgment ye judge).

7<sup>6</sup> (Give not that which is holy to the dogs).

7<sup>15</sup> (Beware of false prophets).

7<sup>17</sup> (Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit).

7<sup>20</sup> (By their fruits ye shall know them).

II. In Luke :

6<sup>24-26</sup> (Woes).

6<sup>27b, 28a</sup> (Do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you).

6<sup>34, 35a</sup> (And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive . . . and your reward shall be great).

6<sup>37b, 38a</sup> (Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned . . . shall they give into your bosom).

6<sup>39a</sup> (And He spake also a parable unto them).

Here there is less evidence than hitherto to lead to a decision. We can but weigh the probabilities in regard to each passage, and indicate on which side the balance appears to lie. Even where the evidence seems least conclusive, we shall endeavour to form a judgement, in order that our reconstruction of the text may be complete.

It is important to bear in mind that the question which we have to consider in regard to each passage, viz. whether it was in Q's Sermon or not, is not the same as the question of whether or not it stood in the historical Sermon. In Chapter VIII we shall take into account the possibility that matter which was in Q's Sermon may not have been in Christ's Sermon. We shall, however, see reason to think that this is not probable. It will be a help to the discussion of the present chapter if we make use of conclusions there reached as to the probable relationship of the one to the other. They are mainly as follows :—that whilst the original Sermon probably contained far more than was embodied in Q's report of it, there is good reason to believe that the matter which Q recorded as part of the Sermon belongs to it historically, and also that the matter which Q recorded elsewhere belongs historically to other occasions. Building upon these conclusions, we shall not hesitate to argue from suitability to the occasion of the historical Discourse. We cannot indeed affirm that, because a passage is suitable to have been spoken in the historical Sermon, therefore we may, solely on that ground, include it in Q's Discourse. The possibility that it may derive from a source other than

Q must also be borne in mind. Still, such suitability is so far forth a recommendation for the inclusion within Q's Sermon of any passage which appears to belong to this source. And we can argue with some confidence that any passage or saying which appears unsuitable to the historical occasion of the Sermon did not form part of the Sermon of Q.

The matter which we have to consider falls into the following main divisions: (1) the Beatitudes and the Woes; (2) the Contrast between the old and the new moral Standards; (3) the Contrasts between the Pharisaic Righteousness and the Christian; and (4) the remaining odd verses in Matthew and Luke. We will consider each of these in order.

I. THE BEATITUDES AND THE WOES, AND THE COMPARISONS OF MT. 5<sup>14</sup> & 16—Here two difficult questions meet us, viz. Did the Sermon of Q contain the Lucan Woes, and, Did it include the Beatitudes which Matthew alone gives?

(a) First, as to the Woes; Lk. 6<sup>24-26</sup>. It is not in accordance with our conception of Luke's literary methods to suppose that he has added them without authority. Nor are they the sort of addition that he would be likely to make. Judging from the rest of the matter peculiar to him, we should say that pronouncements of blessing rather than of woe were congenial to his character and temperament. We may therefore feel fairly confident that he had authority for these Woes, and the close antithetic parallelism between them and the preceding blessings points to both as deriving from the same source. If we may suppose that our Lord, whose mind was certainly steeped in the Old Testament, was influenced (perhaps unconsciously) by the opening of the Psalter, the latter half of the first Psalm contrasting with the Beatitude with which it opens may have suggested to Him the contrast of Beatitudes and Woes. Or it may have been from some other passage that the suggestion came. We may compare with the Sermon the Beatitudes and Curses of the 'Secrets of Enoch,' cc. 42 and 52, and the Talmudic version of Deut. 27 (quoted by Lightfoot, 'Horae Hebr.,' vol. ii. p. 98).

Assuming that the Woes stood in Q, reasons can be given for Matthew's omission of them. He has recorded

a series of seven Woes in c. 23. Thus this aspect of Christ's teaching is adequately represented there, and might seem dispensable here. Then, the earlier position to which we regard him as having consciously transferred the Discourse might lead him to omit what in it seemed inappropriate to so early a date. The Woes might so appear to him on the ground that he had not recorded any opposition to Christ. It looks as though he had substituted for them the comparisons of the disciples to salt and light of vv. 13-16. At all events, vv. 13 and 15, to which Luke has parallels in other contexts, we have seen reason to reject from Q's Sermon.

(b) Mt. 5<sup>14</sup> (Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid); and Mt. 5<sup>16</sup> (Even so let your light shine). It is convenient at this point to consider the other two verses of Mt. 5<sup>13-16</sup>. Here the alternatives we have to consider are these:—Has Matthew found the comparison of light of vv. 14 and 16 in Q's Sermon, and expanded it by the addition from another part of Q of the comparison of salt, and of the saying about the Lamp and Stand, or have these verses also come from another portion of Q, or from some other source or sources? The fact that vv. 14 and 16 stand well by themselves when separated from vv. 13 and 15 suggests that they represent the original Q. And the appropriateness—following the Beatitudes—of the comparison of the disciples to light shining in the dark world is undeniably great. But as in some of the clearest instances of Matthaean compilation there is eminent appropriateness of location, this may here also argue the skill of the compiler instead of the original of the source. It has been supposed that our Lord pointed to Safed as the city set on a hill, because its eminence as seen from the hills on the west of the Lake of Galilee might readily suggest the illustration to a Mind quick to draw parables from nature. But—apart from the question of whether the antiquity of Safed goes back to Christ's days—as it is equally possible that it was on some other occasion that either Safed or some other 'city set on a hill' may have suggested the words, their appropriateness as delivered from the high ground in the neighbourhood of the Lake argues little or nothing as to the historical occasion of their first



utterance. On the other side must be set Luke's omission. It is true that little weight attaches to the omissions of a writer who leaves out so much of his Marcan source. Yet here no reason suggests itself for the omission. It may also be doubted whether our Lord would, at so early a stage in the discipleship of the Twelve, have used in regard to them the words 'Ye are the light of the world'—an expression which, so far as the Gospels record, He did not apply to Himself till later in the Ministry.\* And perhaps a little weight—though slight in view of the more or less unconnected nature of some even of the sayings more definitely united within a single discourse—attaches to the appearance of these verses as breaking the connexion between the statement of the new Law in the Beatitudes, and the contrast between this new Law and the old which begins in Mt. 5<sup>17</sup>. For these reasons we incline to regard the whole of Mt. 5<sup>13-16</sup> as a compilation.

Perhaps it is possible that the compiler has drawn the comparison of light from Lk. 11<sup>36</sup>, and freely adapted it. He has no parallel to this verse in 6<sup>22-23</sup>, and it lies very near the verse (Lk. 11<sup>33</sup>) from which he has drawn 5<sup>15</sup> (Lk. 11<sup>36</sup> refers, however, to the Christian receiving light into himself, whilst Mt. 5<sup>14-16</sup> refers to his shedding light around him). At all events the word φῶς in a metaphorical sense, so characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, occurs in the Double Tradition only in the parabolic saying of the Single and the Evil Eye, and nowhere in Mark. Perhaps, too, it may be surmised that the suggestion of the comparison of light came to Matthew from the quotation of Is. 9<sup>1-2</sup> in 4<sup>15-16</sup>.

To return to the Woes, it may be objected to their inclusion that they are not suitable in an address which we have seen reason to regard as having been primarily delivered to the Twelve. But there is much probability that, with the exception of the last, both they and the contrasted Beatitudes stood in Q, as in Matthew, in the third person form, and not in the second. For, as we shall see when considering the form of the sayings, in several passages drawn from Mark, Luke substitutes the second person for the third. And the last pair of contrasts plainly stand apart

\* First in John 8<sup>12</sup>.



from the others. They have reference to what is future, whilst the others relate to what is present (contrast the  $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$  with a future verb of Lk. 6<sup>22</sup> & 26 with the emphatic  $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$  of vv. 21 and 25). And they are especially, if not exclusively, addressed to the Twelve, who are compared by implication with the prophets of the Old Dispensation. There is therefore much in favour of the originality of the third person form for all the Beatitudes and Woes except the last.<sup>a</sup>

(c) Mt. 5<sup>5</sup>, 7, 8, 9, 10. (The Beatitudes peculiar to Matthew, viz. those pronounced upon the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, and those who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake.)

We have to decide whether these stood in Q, and were omitted by Luke, or whether Matthew has compiled here as elsewhere and added to the Beatitudes of his source.

If the number of the Matthaean Beatitudes was one of the symbolic or sacred Jewish numbers, we might see in it evidence of compilation. Ten is the number we might expect to find. For the Beatitudes in Matthew seem to be recorded with a sense of their contrast to the Ten Words of the Hebrew Decalogue, as constituting the code of the New Law.<sup>b</sup> But the word 'Blessed' occurs nine times only, and the attempt to divide the last Beatitude into two seems futile. It is tempting to regard the Introduction to the Sermon in Mt. 5<sup>1-2</sup>, or even the whole of Mt. 4<sup>23-5<sup>2</sup></sup>, as answering to the Preface of the Decalogue (Exod. 20<sup>2</sup> = Deut. 5<sup>6</sup>), and the nine Beatitudes as corresponding to the nine other Words of the Talmudic division (our first two Commandments being treated as constituting one word).<sup>c</sup> But the Preface to the Decalogue contains the words of God, whilst the Introduction to the Sermon consists only of narrative.

<sup>a</sup> It is possible that, if we are right in thinking that the Lucan account has cast a materialistic interpretation upon the Beatitudes and Woes, the change to the second person may have been a consequence of this. For a personal and specific reference to the hearers might seem more suitable to pronouncements of condition than a general and universal one.

<sup>b</sup> It may be that Matthew found in his source the record of Christ's descent to a level place which Luke narrates in 6<sup>17</sup>, and that he omitted it in order to heighten the correspondence of the enunciation of the new Law from a mountain-top with that of the old Law from the summit of Mount Sinai.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Art. 'Decalogue' in *H.D.B.*, vol. i. p. 581.

There is another feature of the Matthaean Beatitudes which may seem to indicate compilation. They divide into Beatitudes of character and of condition. Omitting the latter, we get the sacred number seven. This is the number in the 'Secrets of Enoch,' c. 42 (B text) and c. 52 (A text). But the first Beatitude denotes condition as well as character. And it hardly seems probable that the distinction between the two types was present to the Evangelist's mind. It does not seem possible therefore to draw any safe inferences from the number of the Matthaean series.

Looking at the Beatitudes individually, we do not find much to guide our judgement. The two which at first sight appear most like the work of the compiler are the third (Blessed are the meek) and the eighth (Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake). The import of the former, interpreted as denoting a disposition towards God, approximates to that of the first. The import of the latter is so indistinguishable from that of the concluding Beatitude that many regard it as constituting with it one Beatitude only (the word 'Blessed' being twice repeated). Also the blessing attached, 'for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven,' is identical with that of the first Beatitude, whilst all the others have been different. Further, the third Beatitude seems based on Psalm 37<sup>11</sup> (οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν LXX), and its position varies in the MSS., some placing it before 'Blessed are they that mourn.'<sup>a</sup>

But (i) the wording of several other of the Beatitudes seems also in part to derive from the O.T. (*e.g.*, *cf.* Ps. 24<sup>4</sup> with οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ). It may be asked, however, whether our Lord would have retained without modification words which in the Psalm bear their literal sense, and are a promise of the inheritance of Canaan. Certainly, none of the other expressions of blessedness have a meaning for us so different from that which they literally bear as this one appears to have. Yet our Lord's language abounds in metaphor and parable, and that from the beginning of His Ministry, when He called His first disciples to be 'fishers of men.'

<sup>a</sup> It is remarkable also that each of the first four qualities which are pronounced Blessed in the Matthaean series begins with the letter π.

(ii) And the eighth Beatitude rather looks as though it was the foundation of the ninth. It seems natural to see in the comparative diffuseness of the last Beatitude the emphatic application to the Apostles of what had previously been more tersely expressed in a general form. And, in view of the prominence later in the Discourse of teaching as to behaviour under persecution, there may well have been two of the Beatitudes pronounced on those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake.

On the whole, then, although we may suspect compilation in the case of these two Beatitudes, there does not appear to be sufficient ground to warrant the exclusion of either of them from the Sermon of Q.

The contents of the other three Beatitudes which are peculiar to Matthew (viz. those pronounced upon the merciful, the pure in heart, and the peacemakers) seem to give them a stronger claim to be regarded as deriving from Q, and if so, probably from Q's Sermon. For, so far as we can judge from the contents of our Gospels, it does not seem very probable that Matthew has compiled these Beatitudes from elsewhere in Q.

But if all these nine sayings were in Q's Sermon, why did Luke omit five of their number? And why did he omit sayings of such value and beauty? It is not easy to give a satisfactory explanation. But it is perhaps significant that the four which Luke records are the only ones which could be construed as Beatitudes of condition. The rest are unmistakably Beatitudes of character. Now we shall see reason to think that the first stood in Q simply as 'Blessed are the poor.' It seems possible that Luke, as a Gentile, was not familiar with the specialised sense which the word 'poor' had acquired among the Jews, and that he understood it simply of economic poverty. He may then have selected from the list those other Beatitudes which seemed to him to refer to conditions of life. He may also have been influenced by a sense of the need of such teaching for the Gentile Christians for whom he was writing, many of whom were doubtless living in poverty and want, and suffering persecution for the sake of Christ.

As to whether Matthew and Luke between them have preserved all the Beatitudes and Woes contained in Q, it is

only possible to form conjectures. It is certainly possible that Q contained other Beatitudes besides those which Matthew records. As Luke has only recorded four Woes contrasting with his four Beatitudes, it seems very probable that he has omitted some of Q's Woes, although it is possible that he has selected four Beatitudes to correspond to each of the Woes which he found in his source. If Q contained some unrecorded Woes, it seems likely that these would include Woes which were unmistakably pronounced upon character. But we cannot infer from Luke's record that there was any precise antithetic parallelism between each of the Beatitudes and each of the Woes contained in Q.

II. THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW MORAL STANDARDS.—The matter here divides into (*a*) the odd verses Mt. 5<sup>17, 19, 20</sup>; (*b*) a large amount of matter in the rest of Mt. 5, together with Lk. 6<sup>27b, 28a, 34, 35a</sup>. We will consider these in order.

(*a*) Mt. 5<sup>17, 19, 20</sup>. The question of the inclusion within the Sermon of Mt. 5<sup>17</sup> (Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets) is closely connected with that of the inclusion of the references at the beginning of the illustrations to what was said to them of old time. And a consideration of Lk. 6<sup>27a</sup>, 'Ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, may help to a decision regarding both.

First, there is the use here by Luke of the adversative particle ἀλλά. It does not seem natural to suppose that it refers back to the haters of Christians mentioned in v. 22, and that we are to interpret it 'although they hate you, you must love them.' Four entire verses have intervened, including the contrasted Woes. It is more natural to suppose the contrast to be with those on whom the Woes have just been pronounced. But how in that case is ἀλλά to be interpreted? It seems far-fetched to read into it the thought 'although I have denounced them, you must love and not hate them.' The most natural interpretation, in view of the emphatic position of ὑμῖν, seems to be the simple one, 'But to you who hear, *i.e.* who are listening with attention to my words, in contrast to those on whom these Woes have been pronounced.' Yet it may be doubted if Luke would thus have expressed himself, apart from the influence of his



source. It seems probable that he found ἀλλά here in his source and retained it. When we turn to Matthew we find that ἀλλά occurs at this point, contrasting the precept, 'Whosoever smites thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,' with the preceding, 'Resist not him that is evil,' which Luke omits. Ἀλλά also occurs in Mt. 5<sup>17</sup>, and it is remarkable that this is the only other occurrence of the word in the whole of Mt. 5<sup>17-48</sup>. Luke has no special fondness for ἀλλά, and his use of it here seems to point to his acquaintance, either with the precept 'Resist not him that is evil,' or with the contents of Mt. 5<sup>17</sup>. Sir John Hawkins thinks that it betrays Luke's acquaintance with a contrast between the old teaching and the new such as Matthew records at the beginning of each of the illustrations.<sup>a</sup> This contrast is always expressed in Matthew by the particle δέ (viz. in Mt. 5<sup>22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44</sup>), and Matthew so often uses ἀλλά that it does not seem probable that he has changed the word which he found in his source. Moreover, δέ would have read more naturally than ἀλλά in Lk. 6<sup>27</sup>. Still, it is possible that Luke may have written ἀλλά under the influence of the idea expressed by the δέ of Matthew, although his choice of the word ἀλλά seems to be due to its occurrence at another point in his source.

Secondly, the words τοῖς ἀκούουσιν do not read quite naturally, and their exact force and reference seem doubtful. As in the case of ἀλλά, so here, it may be doubted if Luke would have thus expressed himself apart from the influence of words occurring in a passage of his source which he has not recorded. It does not seem impossible that Luke may have written τοῖς ἀκούουσιν under the influence of the word ἠκούσατε which occurs at the beginning of each of the illustrations which Matthew records.<sup>b</sup>

On more general grounds also, it appears reasonable to suppose that the contrast between the old teaching and the new was expressed in the Sermon of Q. In view of the reverence in which the Law was held, a Teacher who spoke with absolute authority must have raised in His hearers' minds the question of the relation of His teaching to that

<sup>a</sup> *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 132.

<sup>b</sup> Perhaps also he may have been influenced by the phrase τοῖς ἀρχαίοις.



contained in the sacred Scriptures. Indeed it is not improbable, in view of Christ's teaching and practice on such matters as Sabbath observance and ceremonial cleanness, that some of His enemies had already charged Him with abrogating the Law and the Prophets. If so, it was clearly important that His disciples should receive instruction on this matter. We may conjecture that the enunciation of the Beatitudes would suggest the subject to our Lord's mind. So far as our records inform us, all the elements of blessedness specified by Him were universalistic in character. The question then might well arise in the minds of Jewish hearers, 'What of the blessedness of those who order their lives after the Law? In what relation does this new teaching stand to the words of God delivered to us through Moses?' The omission by Luke of all reference to the old teaching seems intelligible, on the ground that he was writing for Gentile readers. He elsewhere omits matter which might appear less applicable to Gentiles than to Jews (*cf.*, *e.g.*, his omission of the disciples' question about Elijah coming first, and Christ's reply, in his account of the descent from the Mount of Transfiguration).

We therefore accept Mt. 5<sup>17</sup> as the probable introduction to this whole section, and the references in the following illustrations to the old teaching.

Looking now more closely at Mt. 5<sup>17-20</sup>, it seems hypercritical, in the absence of textual evidence, to suspect that the clause ἡ τοῦς προφήτας in Mt. 5<sup>17</sup> was not in Q, on the ground that all the illustrations are taken from the Law: *v.* 18 we have excluded from Q's Sermon, for reasons already given. It is not easy to reach a conclusion regarding *v.* 19 (Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments) and *v.* 20 (Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees). If Q contained so Jewish a saying as that of *v.* 18, it may well have had *v.* 19 also. But if in Q as well as in Lk. 16<sup>17, 18</sup> the saying about the permanence of the Law was followed by the saying against divorce, Mt. 5<sup>19</sup> has been introduced here from another context.

Mt. 5<sup>20</sup> has a verbal link with *v.* 19, in the occurrence in both of the phrase 'the kingdom of the heavens.' But it

does not seem appropriate to its context. It is true that the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees was the righteousness of the keeping of the letter of the Law, and that Christ teaches a righteousness which exceeds this, in that it penetrates to feelings and motives, and absolutely forbids in cases where the old Law only restrained. But the warning seems to refer more naturally to such faults as are exposed in Mt. 6<sup>1-18</sup>, and in other anti-Pharisaic passages.

We are thus led to think that Matthew found *v.* 17 in Q's Sermon, and that he added *vv.* 18, 19, and 20 from elsewhere. He might well preface the illustrations of *vv.* 21 ff. by bringing together several sayings relating to the Law.

(*b*) The rest of Mt. 5 contains six illustrations of the principle laid down in *v.* 17. The occurrence of *πάλιν* before the fourth in *v.* 33 suggests that the compiler regarded them as constituting two triplets. We have already seen ground for excluding from Q's Sermon Mt. 5<sup>32</sup> (concerning divorce), and this involves the exclusion also of the introduction to this saying in Mt. 5<sup>31</sup> (It was said, Whosoever shall put away his wife). A small point in favour of the excision of this third illustration is the fact that of the six introductions this is the only one in which we have the simple *ἐρρέθη* in place of *ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη*.

(*i*) The first question we now have to ask is this: Did Q contain each of the five remaining illustrations, or has Matthew compiled?

*The First Two Illustrations.*—The first two seem to have a strong claim to be considered original to the Sermon. It is natural that our Lord should have begun with these fundamental commandments of the second Table of the Decalogue. Luke may have omitted the first because of the Jewish form in which Christ's teaching is expressed. This omission may have led him also to omit the second, which is parallel to it, and which he may have regarded as constituting with it a pair of illustrations.

*The Third Illustration.*—With regard to the section on oaths, we may feel more hesitation. It may appear to be out of keeping with the others, as treating of a subject of lesser ethical importance. Certainly the teaching of this section

is less arresting than that of the other four. The nature of the contrast is similar to that of the following two illustrations, but it is far easier to accept the prohibition of oaths than it is that of all retaliation and hatred of enemies. Indeed, teaching on oaths similar to that here laid down is found in Ecclus. 23<sup>9-11</sup>, 'Secrets of Enoch' 49<sup>1</sup>, and elsewhere. Yet we know that one of the great differences between the Pharisees and the Essenes lay in their teaching on oaths. Thus it was a prominent subject of controversy and debate in the first century. It does not seem reasonable to suspect this teaching, because our Lord often introduces His sayings with the word ἀμήν, or because, according to Matthew, He did not refuse to speak when adjured at His trial by the High Priest (Mt. 26<sup>63, 64</sup>). It is true that Origen regarded Christ's ἀμήν as a kind of oath, but the truth seems to be, as Dalman says, that it is a form of emphasis which He may have adopted with the conscious purpose of avoiding the use of an oath.<sup>a</sup> With regard to the High Priest's adjuration, it seems precarious to argue that Christ here sanctioned his appeal to the living God. And it is well to remember that Matthew is the only Evangelist who mentions the adjuration. Certainly it is remarkable that, in the whole of Mt. 23<sup>16-22</sup>, there is no hint that our Lord would entirely forbid the use of oaths. But, as here the one aim of the whole passage is to bring into relief the errors and inconsistencies of the Scribes and Pharisees, it is not unintelligible that the diatribe should confine itself to an exposition of the falsity of their casuistical distinctions on this matter.

As with the first illustration, so here, it is possible that Luke was influenced to omit by the Jewish allusions in Christ's teaching.

*The Fourth and Fifth Illustrations.*—With regard to Matthew's remaining two illustrations, the possibility needs to be considered of their having stood in Q as one illustration, introduced by a single reference to the Jewish Law. The differences of Luke's order are here very remarkable. He begins with matter parallel to Matthew's sixth illustration. Then follows matter parallel to the fifth. Finally,

<sup>a</sup> *Words of Jesus*, p. 229.

we have more matter parallel to the sixth. Also, the general similarity of purport of all this matter suggests that it may have formed but one illustration in Q. It is obvious that Matthew's fifth and sixth sections are much less separate in subject-matter than the rest. Moreover, the introduction to the last section may be suspected of being a compiler's addition. Not only is the precept, 'Thou shalt hate thine enemy,' nowhere found in the O.T., but it seems unjustifiable to regard its substance as contained by implication in the restriction of the command to love to a 'neighbour'—*i.e.* (as the context in Lev. 19<sup>18</sup> shows) to one of the 'children of thy people.' For the whole Law was limited to the chosen race, and did not concern itself with what lay beyond them.

It is true that in none of the introductions is there an avowed quotation from the O.T. Instead of 'It is written,' we have 'Ye have heard that it was said.' And in the words 'Whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgement' and 'But shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths,' Christ may be expressing the purport of several texts, rather than alluding to any single passage;—and doing so perhaps in phraseology current among Jewish teachers of His day. But neither of these is a really parallel instance. If the Law does not say precisely that the murderer shall be in danger of the judgement (*κρίσις*), it says what is more, *viz.* that he shall surely be put to death (Ex. 21<sup>12</sup>, and elsewhere). And if it does not say precisely that whoever swears shall perform to the Lord his oaths, it says more explicitly that 'He shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth' (Numb. 30<sup>2</sup>). But the Law neither has 'thou shalt hate thine enemy,' nor its equivalent. The words express the spirit of bitter hatred towards foreigners which was fostered in the Jews by their loss of national independence. Indeed, if *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* refers to those who received the Law, they are not strictly true.

Thus it is tempting to suppose that, with a view to completing his second triplet of illustrations, Matthew has here (instead of introducing matter from elsewhere) divided the matter of Q into two sections according as it bears on non-resistance to evil and love to enemies respectively.



Yet a close examination of the two reports seems to result in a preference being felt for the Matthaean order and arrangement. We have seen reason to think that Luke would probably not have written ἀλλὰ in 6<sup>27a</sup> unless he found it in his source. And ἀλλὰ occurs in the whole of Mt. 5<sup>17-48</sup> only in v. 17, 'I came not to destroy, but to fulfil,' and in v. 39, 'But whosoever smiteth thee,' etc. It is no doubt not impossible that Luke may have been influenced by the former verse, if, as we think, it stood in Q's Sermon. But it appears more probable that it was its occurrence in the latter verse which influenced him. If so, it seems likely that this section opened with the contrast which Matthew gives. In that case Luke has altered Q's order in placing v. 28 before the precepts as to non-resistance in vv. 29 and 30. He may have been influenced by the desire to place first what he regarded as the main command. If the passage about non-resistance stood together first as in Matthew, it seems more probable that the passage about love to enemies was introduced by a separate contrast, than that it ran on without break. Moreover, the καί at the beginning of Lk. 6<sup>32</sup> does not seem quite natural. To these considerations it may be added that there is nothing in the wording of Matthew's sixth illustration to make us suspicious of its having been in Q, and also that, without a separate introduction, the passage would be disproportionate in length as compared with the other illustrations.

(ii) Accepting, then, the five illustrations of Matthew, we have to consider how much of the matter in the two accounts of the Evangelists may fairly claim to have stood in Q's Sermon.

Mt. 5<sup>21-22</sup>. In the first illustration it seems as though we ought to include at least all to the end of v. 22. It is true that there is difficulty in the three specified degrees of offence and of penalty. But all this matter seems too closely connected for it to be reasonable to suppose that Q ended with the words 'Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement,' or at any other point before the close of v. 22.

Mt. 5<sup>23-24</sup>. Ought vv. 23 and 24 also to be included?



## THE ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE CONTRAST 87

It cannot be thought improbable that our Lord would make such an allusion in Galilee. We remind ourselves that it was to the Galilaean leper that our Lord gave the command to offer in the Temple the sacrifice appointed in the Law (Mk. 1<sup>44</sup> and parallels). Yet it seems more likely that the verses have been imported from outside the Sermon. Retaining them, the section ends abruptly; whilst, omitting them, there is an impressive climax. With regard to the οὖν which Matthew has at the beginning of v. 23, no stress can be laid upon it. Matthew is fond of the word, and introduces it into sayings imported from another context, e.g. 6<sup>9</sup> introducing the Lord's Prayer, 7<sup>12</sup> introducing the Golden Rule, and probably 5<sup>19</sup>, already discussed.

Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup>. In the second illustration, it is not easy to make up one's mind about vv. 29 and 30 (If thy right eye offend thee, etc.). We incline towards their omission. Matthew is prone to compile, and if he has made two additions to the first illustration, he may well have made one to the second. Omitting vv. 29 and 30, the second illustration is reduced to a length similar to that of the first, and is relieved of a passage which is off the main line of its teaching.

Mt. 5<sup>33-37</sup>. In the passage on oaths, there seems no good reason for suspecting on internal grounds any part of it. It does not read like a compilation. The different kinds of oaths mentioned are, it is true, similar to those specified in Mt. 23<sup>16-22</sup>; and one (the oath by heaven) is the same. But the two passages do not look as if they were drawn from the same source passage.

Mt. 5<sup>38, 39<sup>a</sup>, 41 & 43</sup>. In the last pair of illustrations we have to consider the matter peculiar to Matthew and to Luke. Matthew's is as follows: vv. 38, 39<sup>a</sup>, 41 and 43.

The descriptions of the old teaching contrast well with the new teaching which our Lord enunciates, and are probably reproduced from Q. In the case of the words in v. 39<sup>a</sup>, 'Resist not him that is evil, but, etc.,' if the ἀλλὰ of Lk. 6<sup>27</sup> comes from the ἀλλὰ of this passage of Q, and if the words following ἀλλὰ in Q were such as Matthew reports, they must have been preceded by a precept such as that of Matthew. Luke's omission of the reference to the *lex talionis* may well have led him to omit also these words,

which look back to it, and to begin reproducing Q at the point where the positive commands occur. It is possible, as Matthew is rather fond of the word *πονηρός*, and introduces it into some Marcan contexts (*cf.* Mt. 9<sup>4</sup>, 13<sup>19</sup>, 16<sup>4</sup> with the Marcan parallels), that some other word of similar purport stood in Q. But, if so, we have no means of ascertaining what that word may have been. It seems safer also to include the words of v. 41, 'And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain.' It has no appearance of being an insertion, and Luke may have omitted it because, to some at least of those for whom he wrote, the exaction which he describes may have been an unfamiliar or even unknown experience. At all events, it is the fact that in the only other context where the word *ἀγγαρεύειν* occurs in the N.T., viz. Mk. 15<sup>21</sup>, Matthew reproduces it whilst Luke expresses the meaning in different words.

Lk. 6<sup>27b, 28a</sup>. The matter peculiar to Luke is 6<sup>27b, 28a, 34, & 35a</sup>. With regard to vv. 27b, 28a, there does not appear to be any reason why Matthew should have omitted this matter, if it stood in Q; *εὐλογεῖν* occurs frequently in Luke, and, as he has used *μισεῖν* in v. 22, he may have been influenced to insert it here. The four precepts in Luke form a double climax, of the evil treatment received, and of the good return enjoined to be made. This may seem to betoken Luke's literary handling of his material. If we are right in thinking that Luke has in this case altered Q's order to give the first place to the precept of love to enemies, he may well have also emphasised it by these additions. Perhaps he had in mind as he wrote the various manifestations of enmity which were directed against the Christians of his day in different parts of the Roman world.

Lk. 6<sup>34, 35a</sup>. In vv. 34, 35a, Luke adds to Matthew's account the words about lending to those from whom we hope to receive, and a repetition of the precept to love our enemies.

It is noteworthy that Lk. 5<sup>36-39</sup> adds to the two parabolic sayings of Mk. 2<sup>21-22</sup> a third saying (the new wine and the old). He thus has a triad of sayings where his source has a pair. And Luke seems fond of triads of sayings.

In 11<sup>34-36</sup> he adds to the sayings of Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup> a third, viz. 'If thy whole body is full of light etc.' In 9<sup>57-62</sup> he adds a third aspirant to the two of Mt. 8<sup>19-22</sup>; and it is possible (if the R.V. text is correct) that in 11<sup>11-12</sup> he adds the illustration of the egg and scorpion to the two of Mt. 7<sup>9-10</sup>.

On the other hand, Matthew often omits from Mark's discourse as well as from his narrative matter; *e.g.* Mk. 9<sup>43-47</sup> has three illustrations (the hand, foot and eye). Mt. 18<sup>8-9</sup> combines the hand and foot in one illustration. He thus has a pair, where Mark has a triad. He does not, however, altogether ignore any one of Mark's three illustrations, and he may have been influenced here by Q's version (*cf.* Mt. 5<sup>29-30</sup>, where there is only a pair of illustrations). Probably, therefore, less weight should be attached to this instance than to that of Luke's addition to Mk. 2<sup>21-22</sup>. But there are a number of other passages where Matthew has omitted from Mark; *e.g.* Mt. 13<sup>57</sup> has 'in his own country and in his own house,' but omits 'amongst his own kindred' (*cf.* Mk. 6<sup>4</sup>); Mt. 16<sup>25</sup> omits the words *καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* of Mk. 8<sup>35</sup>; Mt. 20<sup>22-23</sup> omits the words in Mk. 10<sup>38-39</sup> about being baptised with the baptism where-with Christ is baptised; Mt. 21<sup>9</sup> omits the words 'Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David,' in Mk. 11<sup>10</sup>; Mt. 21<sup>22</sup> omits the words in Mk. 11<sup>25</sup> about the need for forgiveness in prayer; \* Mt. 22<sup>17</sup> omits the words *δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν*; *cf.* Mk. 12<sup>14</sup>; and Mt. 22<sup>37</sup> omits the first part of Christ's answer to the Scribe recorded in Mk. 12<sup>29</sup>. There are also passages in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke, where Matthew is the shorter, and seems to have omitted from what stood in Q; *e.g.* Lk. 17<sup>26-30</sup> gives a pair of illustrations, drawn from the days of Noah and of Lot. Mt. 24<sup>37-39</sup> has only the former. Lk. 12<sup>51-53</sup> gives three sayings of Christ (not peace but division, five in one house divided, and father against son, etc.). Mt. 10<sup>34-36</sup> omits the second, unless v. 36 is regarded as parallel to Luke's 52nd verse. It may be said that these cases are not parallel to the Sermon passage, because in it the matter is assigned by both

\* In Chapter V we have shown reason for thinking that Matthew 6<sup>14-15</sup> is not drawn from this passage of Mark; see pp. 57, 58.

Evangelists to the Sermon. Matthew is not compiling with matter drawn from other contexts of Q, and is therefore less likely to have omitted from his source. But Matthew omits from Mark in cases where he retains the Marcan context.

So far the evidence thus appears inconclusive. In the case before us, however, there seems a balance of probability that the words peculiar to Luke are an addition to Q. For, (1) they constitute a third illustration emphasising the duty of love to enemies. Now, complementary pairs of parables or illustrations bringing out slightly different aspects of some idea are found in all our sources, and may well reflect a characteristic of the teaching of our Lord Himself; *e.g.* in Q we have the twin sayings about the Men of Nineveh and the Queen of the South (Mt. 12<sup>41-42</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>31-32</sup>); in Mark the illustrations of the New Cloth and the New Wine (Mk. 2<sup>21-22</sup>); in the matter peculiar to Matthew, the parables of the Pearl of great Price and the Hidden Treasure (Mt. 13<sup>44-46</sup>); and in the matter peculiar to Luke, the companion sayings about the Tower Builder and the King making War (Lk. 14<sup>28-33</sup>). There is therefore some probability that two sayings enforcing love to enemies stood in Q, as Matthew records, and that Luke has added a third. (2) This probability is increased by the presence in Luke of several triads of sayings or parables. Moreover, it is noteworthy that, in several of these triads, two of the three seem to form a pair, whilst the third stands somewhat apart. (3) An examination of the words in Luke seems to strengthen the probability that they were not in Q. The saying in Lk. 6<sup>34</sup> refers to lending. Luke has had no previous mention of lending, but Matthew has in 5<sup>42</sup>. And we shall see reason for preferring Matthew's version there to that of Lk. 6<sup>30</sup>. If Matthew here represents Q the word *δανείζειν* has occurred in the previous passage of Q relating to non-resistance. And it is to this precept as to lending that Lk. 6<sup>34</sup> is naturally supposed to refer back. But neither of the other two sayings relating to love to enemies has any reference to the previous section of the Sermon on non-resistance.

What we have said about Lk. 6<sup>34</sup> tells in part against



Lk. 6<sup>35</sup> also. It leads us to suspect at least the words καὶ δανείζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες. The word ἀπελπίζειν occurs here only in the N.T., and is hardly likely to have occurred in Q. If Luke has transposed the matter of Q in placing the precepts of love to enemies (Lk. 6<sup>27-28</sup>) before those of non-resistance to evil, he may have made this addition also. It looks as if, regarding the command of love to enemies as the most important of the sayings of Christ in these two sections of Q, he has introduced his report with them, amplified them with two added precepts of similar purport, and then closed his report with a recapitulation of the precept, enforced in different words. We may notice, at the beginning of v. 35, the presence of the characteristic Lucan word πλὴν.

III. THE CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE PHARISAIC RIGHTEOUSNESS AND THE CHRISTIAN (Mt. 6<sup>1-8, 14-18</sup>).

Mt. 6<sup>7-8 & 14-15</sup>, as they stand, attach themselves to the Lord's Prayer of vv. 9-13. It is in contrast to the false heathen ideas and practices referred to in vv. 7-8 that Christ's disciples are enjoined to pray after the manner of the pattern which He gives them (*cf.* οὖν and ὑμεῖς in v. 9a). Vv. 14-15 clearly refer back to the clauses in the Prayer, 'And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors' (*cf.* γάρ in v. 14). If, then, these verses so stood in connexion with the Prayer in Matthew's source, they will, like the Prayer, not be a part of Q's Sermon. But it is not certain that their connexion with the Lord's Prayer goes back to the source. It may be due to the compiler. For they are not brought into connexion with it by Luke; and it does not appear very probable that, had they so stood, Luke would have omitted them. Indeed, what we know of Luke leads us to think that they are words which he would delight to record.

This argument, however, can also be used against the inclusion of these verses in Q's Sermon. If Luke found them there, it does not seem likely that he would have omitted them. And there are other grounds for thinking that they were not in Q's Discourse. If Matthew inserted the Lord's Prayer, and all Mt. 6<sup>19-34</sup>, from elsewhere, he may well have also inserted these verses. Moreover, it may



be thought somewhat improbable that our Lord would refer to the errors of the heathen in the Sermon. Anyhow, the reference comes in suspiciously in the middle of a passage treating of the errors of the hypocritical Pharisees. And vv. 14-15 are to a considerable extent paralleled by Mark in a quite different, and much later, context, viz. 11<sup>25</sup>.

Omitting then these verses, there remain Mt. 6<sup>1-6</sup>, & 16-18. In regard to these, a decision is not easy. The errors they condemn are especially Pharisaic, and the phraseology and allusions are Jewish (*e.g.* δικαιοσύνη in v. 1, ὑποκριταί in vv. 2, 5, 16, μὴ σαλπίσσης ἔμπροσθέν σου in v. 2). It is thus the sort of matter which Luke might well omit. On the other hand, assuming that these verses were not in Q's Sermon, they might well suggest themselves to the compiler of Matthew for insertion in the Discourse, and at this point, after the revision of the old moral standards.

Luke not only omits the whole of the contents of Mt. 6 from his report of the Sermon, but he also reads καὶ μὴ κρίνετε in c. 6<sup>37</sup> in place of μὴ κρίνετε of Mt. 7<sup>1</sup>. He thus seems to connect this precept closely with the preceding injunction (Lk. 6<sup>36</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>48</sup>) to be merciful (Mt. perfect) as our Father is merciful (Mt. perfect). There are here two questions to be considered: (*a*) Is this καὶ an insertion by Luke or is it original to his source? (*b*) If it is original, does it constitute a reason against conceding any intervening matter to have stood in Q between Lk. 6<sup>36</sup> & 37?

As to (*a*), it seems probable that this καὶ stood in Q; for, firstly, in the first two clauses of Lk. 6<sup>37</sup> there are four καὶ's, in close juxtaposition. Such a collocation is not elegant Greek, and Luke is not likely to be responsible for it. Even if we suppose him to have inserted the first, no reason suggests itself why he should have put in the third. But the first and third are parallel, and, if the third is original, that is some reason for thinking the first also to be so. Secondly, if this first καὶ is the resumptive καὶ, which occurs so frequently in Mark, it is likely to be original to the source, for it is not in Luke's own style. It seldom occurs in Acts, and a comparison of Mark and Luke shows that Luke often omits the Marcan καὶ at the

beginning of a section. The instances of its occurrence in Luke's Gospel of the Infancy and the beginning of the Acts (*cf.* Lk. 2<sup>8, 15, 21</sup>, Acts 1<sup>15, 21</sup>) are naturally, therefore, referred to Luke's sources. The same is probably the case here also. Thirdly, the absence of this καί from Matthew is not a serious objection, for Matthew also frequently omits the resumptive καί of Mark.

But, (*b*), accepting the καί as original to Q, it follows from what we have said that it may be due to the paratactic syntax of the source, and is not improbably an instance of the resumptive καί which is so often found at the beginning of Mark's sections. It would seem, therefore, that we cannot argue from this καί against the presence in Q of any intervening matter between Lk. 6<sup>36</sup> = Mt. 5<sup>48</sup> and Lk. 6<sup>37</sup> = Mt. 7<sup>1</sup>.

Nor does it seem possible to draw any inference from the general relation of the teaching of these verses to contemporary Jewish instruction. It might be thought that the precepts here are so much less novel and startling than those of Mt. 5<sup>21-48</sup> that it is not probable that they followed them in Q's Sermon. But, according to Mr. Montefiore, whilst the precepts about almsgiving have Rabbinic parallels, and whilst the Rabbis also derided hypocrisy in prayer, our Lord strikes a new note in exalting private prayer, and His rule about fasting is 'highly original.'<sup>a</sup>

A close examination of these verses, however, brings to light several considerations which are not favourable to their inclusion in the Sermon of Q.

(1) They seem to connect with Mt. 5<sup>20</sup>. They are illustrations of the teaching of this verse, as Mt. 5<sup>21-48</sup> are of Mt. 5<sup>17</sup>. This verse constitutes, as it were, the text of the Discourse. In Mt. 5<sup>20</sup>, as in Mt. 6<sup>1</sup>, δικαιοσύνη seems to be used to denote the religious life, as expressed in the carrying out of religious duties. This is some reason for thinking that, as Mt. 5<sup>20</sup> does not appear to have been part of Q's Sermon, these verses also were not included within it.

(2) Mt. 6<sup>6</sup> contains the precept, 'But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and, having shut

<sup>a</sup> *Syn. Gospels*, vol. ii. pp. 529, 530, 538.

thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret.' It seems probable that our Lord intended this injunction to be observed literally, and that He is not speaking in a figurative way of unostentatious retirement within the inner chamber of the heart. There may be a reminiscence of the precept of Is. 26<sup>20</sup>, or of the secret prayer of Elisha in the upper room of the Shunammite recorded in 2 Kings 4<sup>33</sup>. The latter must be understood literally, and the precept of Isaiah may be intended literally also. But, if our Lord intended this injunction about prayer to be understood by His hearers literally, it does not seem very appropriate to the occasion.

(3) In Mt. 6<sup>16</sup> our Lord says, 'When ye fast' (ὅταν), not 'if ye fast.' He thus seems to assume that they will fast. But in Mk. 2<sup>19</sup> He says of His disciples that 'as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.' And the Sermon was delivered on the occasion of the choice of the Twelve, 'that they might be with Him' (Mk. 3<sup>14</sup>). And it seems probable that they continued to enjoy His bodily presence for nearly two years from this date. It may be argued, therefore, that the words probably belong to a later period of the Ministry, or else that they were not addressed primarily to the Twelve.

(4) The references in Mt. 6<sup>2, 5, 16</sup> to the ostentatious Pharisees as 'hypocrites' also seem to favour a later date in the Ministry. The whole passage reminds one of the great invective against the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees which Matthew and Luke both place much later (Mt. 23<sup>1-36</sup>, Lk. 11<sup>39-52</sup>, cf. Mk. 12<sup>38-40</sup>;—cf. πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς in Mt. 6<sup>1</sup> with πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις in Mt. 23<sup>5</sup>).

(5) It is possible that the whole of this passage has specific reference to the public fast days for rain, which were held in seasons of drought during October and November. Dr. Büchler has given several reasons in favour of this supposition.\* He says: 'I can recall no reference in early Rabbinical literature to people who prayed in the streets, unless it be inferred, from the express legal prohibition of the practice, that it occurred. But as to sounding the trumpet while giving alms; the commentators take the

\* In the *Journal of Theol. Studies*, January 1909 (vol. x. pp. 266-270).

phrase metaphorically; while yet the rest of the passage must be explained literally, unless it is to lose all force. The clue to the real meaning of the whole section may be found, I believe, in the very phrase which, so far from being a metaphor, directs us to the only circumstances under which the reproaches would have been relevant. . . . All these difficulties disappear, and the whole passage becomes intelligible, when the verses are referred to the procedure on *public fasts*. The Mishnah tells us that on these days of public fasting on occasion of a drought, the scene of the service was the street or market-place ("Taanith," ii. § 1 *seq.*); the leaders of the community gathered there round the Ark containing the Law; and after an address by one of the Rabbis, who reminded the assemblage of the example of Nineveh and called his hearers to genuine repentance, the prayers for rain commenced. Here, then, we have the only prayers recorded as being recited in the streets, and of the many present it may well be that some joined with no true humiliation in their hearts but to be seen of men in the assembly, and some stood at the street corners praying with questionable sincerity . . . it is especially to be noticed that on such occasions the ram's horn (shofar) was blown after each of the six additional benedictions at the end of the prayers. The overseer (ḥazan) of the congregation gave the direction, "Blow, ye priests, blow (the horn)," and again, "Sound, ye sons of Aaron, sound!" We have, at all events, the precise statement that this was the mode of procedure in Sepphoris in the age of Ḥalafta and Ḥananja ben Teradjou.<sup>a</sup> Now it was well understood that on such days, when God's mercy was besought, men must themselves exercise mercy practically in the form of almsgiving.'

The facts here set forth by Dr. Büchler are certainly striking, and lend support to the specific reference which he advocates. If we accept it, a certain probability follows that our Lord's words were uttered during the period of these observances, as Dr. Büchler thinks. But we have seen reason to think that the Sermon was delivered about harvest-time, or shortly after (see Chapter IV, p. 45).

<sup>a</sup> Rabbi Yosé ben Ḥalaphtā flourished c. A.D. 130-160. Rabbi Ḥananja (or Ḥaninā) ben Teradjou suffered as a martyr in A.D. 135.



(6) The parallelism and homogeneity of the three divisions of Mt. 6<sup>1-6, 16-18</sup> are remarkable. The illustrations of the contrast between the old moral standards and the new in the preceding passage do not exhibit anything equal to this balance and parallelism. Perhaps it is on this ground more likely, as Dean Robinson thinks,<sup>a</sup> that these verses constitute a 'little sermon' which at one time 'had a separate existence of its own,' than that they are a continuation of Q's Discourse.

As against these six considerations, there does not seem to be very much that can be urged on the other side. The correspondence between the thrice repeated ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν of Mt. 6<sup>2, 5, 16</sup> and the words ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν in the Woe of Lk. 6<sup>24</sup> is rather striking, and there are several verbal correspondences with the preceding verses of Matthew; cf. μισθός in Mt. 6<sup>1, 2, 5, 16</sup> and in 5<sup>46</sup>; ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in Mt. 6<sup>1</sup> and in 5<sup>45</sup> (τοῖς omitted; cf. 5<sup>48</sup>). Some of the reasons brought forward above depend for their force upon the precise wording of Matthew. It is possible that Matthew has in some of these instances altered the wording of his source. But, in the absence of evidence, we can but judge from the text as it stands, and we conclude that, so far as the evidence of that text points, the probability is against these verses having formed part of Q's Discourse.

Mt. 6<sup>34</sup>. This odd verse obviously attaches itself to the passage against anxiety for the morrow, which we have decided not to include. It goes out, together with the whole section to which it belongs.

IV. THE REMAINING ODD VERSES IN MATTHEW AND LUKE.—There remain, in Matthew, the odd verses 7<sup>2a, 6, 15, 17, 20</sup>, and, in Luke, 6<sup>37b, 38a</sup> and 39<sup>a</sup>. We will consider these in order.

In Mt. 7<sup>2a</sup> the words 'For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged' seem to have a balance of probability in their favour, especially if, as we shall see reason for thinking, the additional words of Lk. 6<sup>37</sup>, forming two pairs of precepts, are original. If Matthew is here curtailing his source, it may seem improbable that he would

<sup>a</sup> *Study of the Gospels*, p. 79.

insert this clause, the thought of which is included in the parallel saying, 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you.'

Mt. 7<sup>6</sup> also, on the whole, it seems safer to accept than to reject. It has indeed been thought to be one of the 'ecclesiastical additions' in the single tradition of Matthew, and to have been developed out of the saying to the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mt. 15<sup>26</sup>). But no motive for its insertion where Matthew has it seems to suggest itself. It is certainly unrelated to the passage on prayer which follows it, and it does not naturally connect with the verses against judging others which precede it. For it does not seem reasonable to interpret it of the offering of valuable criticism which the recipients are not disposed to heed. Probably, then, Matthew has recorded it where he found it in Q. Luke may well have omitted it, because of its Jewish expression, which might be enigmatical to Gentile readers. If he understood the reference of the 'dogs' and 'swine' to be to Gentiles, this would be an additional reason for omission. There is no place in Q where the saying may more appropriately have occurred than at the close of the Sermon, after the delivery to the Twelve of its pearls of holy teaching. We therefore incline to the view that it stood in Q's Discourse, and probably after the parable of the Mote and the Beam.

That this is its true position seems to derive support from a consideration of Mt. 7<sup>15</sup> (the warning against false prophets). It is not easy to explain Luke's omission of this verse if it was in the Sermon. We know from St. Paul's Letters, and from early Christian literature outside the N.T., how great was the peril of false prophets in several of the Gentile churches. St. Luke must have known it too. The meaning of the words would not have been obscure to Gentile readers. It is almost incredible, in view of St. Luke's close association with St. Paul, and of the greatness of the peril from false prophets among Gentile Christians, that if these words had been in Q's Sermon, Luke would have left them out.

The verse in Matthew is most appropriate as an introduction to the comparison of the good and the bad trees.

But here, as elsewhere, this appropriateness may be due to the skill of the compiler. It seems to be more than outweighed by the inappropriateness to the historical situation of the warning. If the Sermon was addressed primarily to the Twelve, we naturally assume that our Lord here turns to address the multitude, to whom the words are more applicable. But not even to the multitude are the words suitable on this occasion. The true Christian prophets are before their eyes. The peril of false Christian prophets was not likely to come to the fore during the Ministry of Christ, and the other warnings of this kind in the Synoptics occur in the eschatological Discourse of Mk. 13 and parallels. Moreover, there is much compilation in Matthew's preceding verses. He has inserted 7<sup>7-11</sup> from another context of Q, 7<sup>12</sup> from another position in Q's Sermon, and 7<sup>13-14</sup> from yet another part of Q. He may well be also responsible for the introduction here of 7<sup>15</sup>. It is some corroboration of this that in 24<sup>11</sup> he has inserted a prediction of the advent of false prophets into a context drawn from Mark.

It may be noted that if we place Mt. 7<sup>6</sup> between the 42nd and 43rd verses of Lk. 6 we seem to get a better connexion. As the text of Luke stands, this seems to be that only those who by first casting the beam out of their own eye have become comparable to a good tree can bring forth good fruit in the shape of reforming the characters of others. But, if we precede v. 43 by Mt. 7<sup>6</sup>, the sequence of thought appears to be this: 'Do not proffer the holy teaching I have delivered to you to people who are utterly unworthy of it, and who will resent instead of welcoming it. For remember that there are good and bad human hearts, as there are good and bad trees. And you cannot expect a bad heart to bring forth good conduct such as I have been setting before you.'

Mt. 7<sup>17</sup> & 20. In discussing Matthew's doublets, we gave reasons for excluding Mt. 7<sup>19</sup>. Probability seems also to favour the exclusion of vv. 17 and 20. They do not add any distinctly new matter, but merely reinforce the teaching of what Luke reproduces. This suggests that they may be additions, introduced in the course of catechetical instruction. And, in fact, Matthew in several instances adds matter of a didactic or explanatory character to what he

draws from Mark. And this sometimes takes the form of a sentence or two, at or near the close of a section summing up, or clinching, or making definite and explicit, the teaching or the meaning of what has been recorded—*e.g.* 16<sup>12</sup> (at the close of the passage on the leaven of the Pharisees); 17<sup>13</sup> (at the close of the passage on the coming of Elijah); and 21<sup>43</sup> (at the close of the parable of the wicked husbandmen). With the repetition in Mt. 7<sup>20</sup> of 7<sup>16a</sup> may be compared the repetition in 20<sup>16</sup> of 19<sup>30</sup>, and in 25<sup>13</sup> of 24<sup>42</sup>. Moreover, there does not appear to be any trace of these verses in Mt. 12<sup>33-37</sup> (except possibly the single word  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ).

It may be added that there appears to be no reason for supposing that any of the matter peculiar to Matthew in 12<sup>33-37</sup> was part of the Sermon of Q. V. 34a could not occur in an address directed primarily to the Apostles. Vv. 36 and 37, while not impossible in the Sermon, appear to be another instance of an explanatory and summary conclusion to a section, such as has been illustrated above. If so, Matthew's insertions here lend support to the view that he has inserted matter in a similar way, where he uses the same Q section in 7<sup>16-20</sup>.

Lk. 6<sup>37b, 38a</sup>. Turning now to Luke, he adds in vv. 37b, 38a, the precept not to condemn, and the injunctions to release and to give, followed by the words about the good measure. For the latter the probability seems considerable that he had source authority. It is hardly an addition which he would be likely to make without it. In Matthew's report there is nothing before the last clause of 7<sup>2</sup> to suggest the thought of overflowing measure, and it may be doubted if the words in which the thought is clothed are such as Luke would have used, had he been expressing himself in his own way. The only words in the passage which are in any degree favourites of Luke are the verb  $\sigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  and the noun  $\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\pi\omicron\varsigma$ . If Luke had source authority for these words, it is probable (as it is not his custom to compile or to mix his sources) that he found them here in Q. If so, at least the precept  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\omicron\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  seems to be required as an introduction to them. And it is in accordance with the teaching of our Lord generally that His precepts here should have been positive as well as



negative.<sup>a</sup> With regard to the other two precepts which Luke's account here adds to that of Matthew, it may be thought that one or both are due to Luke's amplification of his source. Certainly he seems to show a partiality for groupings of four; *e.g.* he records four Beatitudes and four Woes, he has four words descriptive of persecution in 6<sup>22</sup>, four precepts enjoining love to enemies in vv. 27-28, four illustrations of non-resistance to evil in vv. 29-30, and four words descriptive of the measure of v. 38. But, in the case before us, as in some of the others, there seems to be reason for thinking each of the four precepts to be original. The precept to release seems needed to form the transition from the idea of judging (which here means condemning) to that of giving. And, if so, it seems natural that these two positive precepts should have been balanced by the two negative ones which Luke gives. Perhaps this view derives some support from the two parallel statements of Mt. 7<sup>2</sup>, if, as we think, the first as well as the second was in Q. We may compare also the two precepts of Mt. 5<sup>44</sup>.

There is little difficulty in the supposition that Matthew has here omitted, for he has altogether omitted (in his report of the Sermon) vv. 39 and 40, which follow in Luke, and v. 45. Moreover, the result of his omission of vv. 37 and 38 of Luke, coupled with that of vv. 39 and 40, is to make the passage on the Mote and the Beam an illustration and enforcement of the precept not to judge others, and this may be intentional on his part.

Lk. 6<sup>39a</sup>. In v. 39a Luke alone has the introductory words, 'And He spake a parable unto them.' It appears probable that these are an insertion by Luke into his source, for he has made similar insertions into his Marcan source; *cf.* Lk. 5<sup>36</sup> with Mk. 2<sup>21</sup>, and Lk. 21<sup>29</sup> with Mk. 13<sup>28b</sup>. Besides, Luke several times uses similar words in introductory matter peculiar to himself; *cf.* 12<sup>16</sup>, 13<sup>6</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>, 18<sup>1</sup>, 18<sup>9</sup>, 19<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> We may possibly find some corroboration of these two positive precepts in a passage in Clement's *Ep. to the Corinthians*, c. 13, where he quotes some words of Jesus in a form which does not seem to have been taken from any Gospel, but to have come down on tradition: ἀφιετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν . . . ὡς διδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

<sup>b</sup> The latter instance is not so clear as the former, for the word παραβολή occurs in Mk. 13<sup>28</sup>, and Luke may have derived it thence.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE DETAILED WORDING AND ORDER OF Q'S SERMON

We have now sifted the contents of the two reports of the Sermon. The matter which we have decided to accept as probably drawn from the Sermon of Q divides into five sections, and is as follows:—

- (1) The Beatitudes and Woes: Mt. 5<sup>3-12</sup>; Lk. 6<sup>20b-26</sup>.
- (2) The Revision of Moral Standards: Mt. 5<sup>17, 21-22, 27-28, 33-48</sup>, 7<sup>12</sup>; Lk. 6<sup>27a, 28b, 29-33, 35b, 36</sup>.
- (3) Warnings against criticising others: Mt. 7<sup>1-5</sup>, 15<sup>14, 10<sup>24-25</sup></sup>; Lk. 6<sup>37-42</sup>.
- (4) The Duty of Discrimination in publishing sacred Truth, the good and the bad Tree and the good and the bad Heart: Mt. 7<sup>6, 16, 18</sup>, 12<sup>33-35</sup>; Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup>.
- (5) The Duty of doing as well as hearing: Mt. 7<sup>21, 24-27</sup>; Lk. 6<sup>46-49</sup>.

Our aim in the present chapter is to reconstruct a Greek text of Q from a detailed examination of this accepted matter. We shall set down as briefly as possible the reasons which seem to favour the preferred wording or order in each instance; then we shall append our reconstructed text *in extenso*, with the matter of Matthew and Luke from which it is drawn arranged in parallel columns (see p. 126). We shall use the Greek text adopted by the revisers of the Authorised Version.

Mt. 5<sup>3</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>20b</sup>. τῷ πνεύματι omitted. πνεῦμα is a favourite word of Luke. It occurs in Luke's Gospel 36 times, including 10 times in the Gospel of the Infancy; and 70 times in the Acts. Matthew has it only 19 times. Luke has inserted it into a Marcan context in 8<sup>55</sup>. He also has it alone in undoubted Q passages (*cf.* 7<sup>21</sup>, 11<sup>13</sup>) and elsewhere

(cf. 4<sup>1, 14</sup>). On the other hand, Matthew omits it, or substitutes other wording, in his parallels to Mk. 2<sup>8</sup>, 5<sup>2, 8, 13</sup>, 7<sup>25</sup>, 8<sup>12</sup>, 9<sup>17, 20, 25</sup> (twice).

But עניים simply, without further definition, seems to have been a current designation of the faithful and God-fearing Israelites as opposed to the worldly and indifferent (cf. Driver, Art. 'Poor' in Hastings' D.B.). רוח is sometimes indeed added to adjectives to express their reference to the inner character; but here, as elsewhere, our Lord seems to have taken up a current Jewish term. The expression 'poor in spirit' does not occur in the Canonical or Apocryphal books. The nearest approach is 'poor and of a contrite spirit' in Is. 66<sup>2</sup>; cf. Ps. 34<sup>18</sup> 'The Lord . . . saveth such as be of a contrite spirit.' If there was no defining word in the Aramaic original, that is some reason for thinking that there was none also in the Greek translation of Q used by the Evangelists. In the LXX the expression πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι does not occur.

αὐτῶν preferred to ὑμετέρα (and in the other Beatitudes and the Woes, except the last Beatitude and the last Woe).

Luke changes the 3rd person of Mark into the 2nd in several instances; cf. Mk. 2<sup>16, 19, 24</sup> with their Lucan parallels. Also, in the Q passage Mt. 11<sup>18</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>34</sup>, Matthew has λέγουσιν and Luke λέγετε.

On the other side it should be noted that Mt. 3<sup>17</sup> has the voice at the Baptism in the 3rd person form, whilst Mk. 1<sup>11</sup> = Lk. 3<sup>22</sup> both have it in the 2nd. But if Matthew and Luke are both following Q here, rather than Mark, it is possible that Q had the 3rd person form, and that Matthew has retained it, whilst Luke has changed it to the 2nd.

ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν preferred here and elsewhere to ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. It is true that Matthew has substituted τῶν οὐρανῶν for τοῦ θεοῦ of Mk. in Mk. 1<sup>15</sup> = Mt. 4<sup>17</sup>, Mk. 4<sup>11</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>11</sup>, Mk. 4<sup>30</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>31</sup>, Mk. 10<sup>14</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>14</sup>, Mk. 10<sup>15</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>3</sup>, Mk. 10<sup>23</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>23</sup>; also that the expression is peculiar to Matthew in the N.T. and that it is not found in the LXX (the reading βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν which Tischendorf adopts in Jn. 3<sup>5</sup> is probably not original. It may have crept

into early MSS through the influence of the word οὐρανός which occurs three times in v. 13).

But the phrase belonged to the current religious language of the Jews (*cf.* Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 91 ff.), and there is reason for thinking that our Lord did not often use the Divine Name (*cf. ibid.* pp. 194-198). Matthew may well have found the phrase in Q, and have introduced it into Mark (*cf.* Allen in 'Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem,' p. 241). Luke may have altered the phrase of Q out of regard for his Gentile readers, and other N.T. writers may have avoided it for the same reason. In the case of the more Jewish N.T. writings, the non-occurrence of the expression may be accidental.

Mt. 5<sup>8</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>21a</sup>. τὴν δικαιοσύνην omitted. If the first Beatitude of Q did not contain a defining phrase, the corresponding phrases in the other Beatitudes may also be Matthaean additions. The same motive, viz. the desire to make the interpretation explicit, would account for the insertion of all three. We shall, however, see reason to accept τῇ καρδίᾳ of Mt. 5<sup>8</sup> as probably original. But there seems to be no particular ground for thinking τὴν δικαιοσύνην original; and the word δικαιοσύνη is characteristic of the First Gospel, being found in Matthew 7 times, once only in Luke, and not at all in Mark.

καὶ διψῶντες retained. The words 'hunger' and 'thirst' are found in close juxtaposition in several N.T. passages; *cf.* Mt. 25<sup>35-44</sup>, Jn. 6<sup>35</sup>, Rom. 12<sup>20</sup>, 1 Cor. 4<sup>11</sup>, Rev. 7<sup>16</sup>.

νῦν omitted, here and in the other Beatitudes and Woes. It is true that Luke has never inserted νῦν into matter drawn from Mark, and that he has omitted all the three occurrences in Mark, viz. 10<sup>30</sup>, 13<sup>19</sup>, 15<sup>32</sup>. Also Matthew has omitted one of the Marcan occurrences; *cf.* Mk. 10<sup>30</sup> with Mt. 19<sup>29</sup>. But not much weight attaches to this omission, because the expression in Mark is redundant (νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ). And on the other side (1) Matthew inserts νῦν twice into Marcan matter, and in one case it bears the same sense as here; *cf.* Mk. 14<sup>64</sup> with Mt. 26<sup>65</sup>, and the addition to Mk. 15<sup>32</sup> in Mt. 27<sup>43</sup>; (2) νῦν is fairly common in the non-Markan parts of Luke, and in the Acts, where it is occasionally used in the same sense as here.



(3)  $\nu\tilde{\nu}\nu$  does not seem so appropriate to these Beatitudes and Woes, interpreted as referring to character, as if we interpret them as referring to condition. In a future chapter we shall see reason to think that it is to inward dispositions that they have reference.

Mt. 5<sup>4</sup> = Lk 6<sup>21b</sup>.  $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  καὶ κλαίοντες preferred, because (1) Luke has  $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  καὶ κλαύσετε in the contrasted Woe; (2) both verbs occur together in Mk. 16<sup>10</sup>, Jas. 4<sup>9</sup>, Rev. 18<sup>11, 15, 19</sup>; (3) the two words form a parallel to  $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  καὶ διψῶντες. If Matthew has changed the order of Q's Beatitudes, this may have led him to omit καὶ κλαίοντες.

But it is possible (a) that Luke has altered an original  $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  to κλαίειν; for in 7<sup>32</sup> (Q) he has κλαίειν where Mt. 11<sup>7</sup> has κόπτεσθαι; and he uses the word in passages peculiar to himself, both in his report of Christ's words, 6<sup>25</sup>, 7<sup>13</sup>, 23<sup>28</sup> (twice), and also in his own narrative, 7<sup>38</sup>, 19<sup>41</sup>; (b) that Matthew has altered an original κλαίειν to  $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ ; for in 9<sup>15</sup> he has substituted  $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  for the  $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  of Mk. 2<sup>19</sup>.

$\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  preferred to γελάσετε. The word used in the corresponding Woe was probably γελᾶν or some such word. It could hardly have been  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . Assuming that γελᾶν stood in the Woe, Luke may have been influenced to insert it here in the Beatitude by its presence in the Woe. This is the only case where the same word is used by Luke to describe a state of blessedness and a state upon which a Woe is pronounced. It does not seem probable that it represents the original Q.

As to the order of the first four Beatitudes, it seems on the whole wiser to follow Luke in placing the Beatitude on those who hunger before that on those who weep. Luke gives the Woes in the same order. It is hard to think that he has in both cases transposed the order of his source.

The Beatitude pronounced upon the meek clearly forms a pair with that pronounced upon the poor, as the other two Beatitudes form a pair. It is natural therefore to suppose that the Beatitudes on the poor and the meek stood next to each other in Q; and the Western text of Matthew so places them.

Mt. 5<sup>8</sup>. τῇ καρδίᾳ retained, although parallel to τῷ πνεύματι and τὴν δικαιοσύνην, which have been omitted. καθάρως in the LXX is generally the translation of טָהוֹר, which usually bears a ceremonial sense. From the subsequent teaching of our Lord we may feel certain that the reference in this Beatitude is not to ceremonial purity. It does not seem probable, therefore, that Q read καθάρως simply. It would be misleading in virtue of its LXX associations. Either, then, we may suppose, Q read some other word of a more distinctively ethical flavour, e.g. ἄγνός, or it read, as in Matthew, καθάρως with the defining phrase τῇ καρδίᾳ, or some other such phrase. As there seems to be no reason why the word of Q should have been changed, the latter hypothesis appears the more probable. Its probability would be much increased if it could be shown to be likely that the original Aramaic of Christ had a word corresponding to the phrase τῇ καρδίᾳ. In our discussion of the meaning of the Beatitudes in a future chapter we shall see reasons for thinking that such is, in fact, the case.

Perhaps, then, we may suppose that the occurrence in Q of this defining phrase suggested the addition in Matthew of the other corresponding phrases in the Beatitudes.

Mt. 5<sup>10</sup>. ἔνεχεν δικαιοσύνης omitted. These defining words are parallel to τῷ πνεύματι and τὴν δικαιοσύνην above. And, as we have already noticed, δικαιοσύνη is a Matthaean word.

Mt. 5<sup>11</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>22</sup>. οἱ ἄνθρωποι omitted. The words in this sense do not seem to be either a favourite expression or the reverse with either Matthew or Luke. But the balance of probability seems in favour of omission, for Matthew usually reproduces them in his parallels to Mark. It is in his parallels to Mk. 7<sup>1-23</sup> that he does not always do so, and here his desire to shorten Mark is specially evident. Moreover, in two instances in this passage he substitutes an equivalent expression for Mark's words, viz. ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ for the ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος of Mk. 7<sup>11</sup>, and εἰς τὸ στόμα for the εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον of Mk. 7<sup>18</sup>.

ὄταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς (Lk.) retained. μισεῖν does not occur in Acts, and only 6 times elsewhere in Luke. Thus

it is not a favourite Lucan word. It is a Q word; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Mt. 6<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>13</sup>.

καὶ ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς (Lk.) retained. ἀφορίζω occurs here only in Luke, and twice only in Acts.

καὶ διώξωσι (Mt.) retained. διώκω occurs only 5 times elsewhere in Matthew. It is found 3 times in Luke, and 9 times in Acts. The similarity between the last two Beatitudes is so great that perhaps it is probable that the word διώκω of the eighth would recur in the ninth.

καὶ εἰπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν (Mt.) preferred to καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν (Lk.); for (1) Luke has εἰπωσι in the Woe of 6<sup>26</sup>, and πάντες there may be some support to the originality of πᾶν here; (2) the Lucan version is better Greek than the Matthaean.

ψευδόμενοι (Mt.) omitted. It is not certain that it belongs to the true text of Matthew, for it is omitted by D, k, the Sinaitic Syriac, etc. But, even if it is part of the true text of Matthew, it seems probable that it is an addition to the text of Q, for (1) it is easier to understand its insertion into the original Q than its omission from it; (2) in the preceding Beatitudes Matthew has several words and phrases which look like additions made to render the meaning more clear and unmistakable.

ἐνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Lk.) preferred to ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ (Mt.). While the latter phrase is found in each of the Synoptics, its use is but rare. The former phrase, on the other hand, appears as Jesus' customary mode of referring to Himself. According to Mk. 2<sup>10, 28</sup>, He had already used it of Himself at the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum, and when defending His disciples for plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath.

Harnack ('Sayings of Jesus,' pp. 52 f.) thinks that ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ is an addition to the original text of Matthew, and that the Lucan equivalent was not in Q. This does not seem probable.

Mt. 5<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>23</sup>. χαίρετε (Mt.) preferred to χάρητε (Lk.). It is less good Greek.

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ retained. The balance of probability seems to be slightly in favour of originality. Neither Matthew nor Luke seems to have any predilection either for

or against the phrase. It occurs 9 times in Mark, 12 times in Matthew, 10 times in Luke, and 5 times in Acts. It is found in no passage peculiar to Matthew, and in but one passage peculiar to Luke. Nor does an examination of the parallels to Mark yield any decisive evidence. (1) Matthew inserts it into 5 passages of Mark, viz. Mk. 4<sup>1</sup>, 12<sup>8</sup>, 12<sup>34</sup>, 13<sup>20</sup> (twice).—We might add Mk. 1<sup>4</sup> = Mt. 3<sup>1</sup>, but it is doubtful if Matthew is not here drawing from Q also.—But Matthew also omits 5 of Mark's occurrences, viz. Mk. 1<sup>9</sup>, 2<sup>20</sup>, 4<sup>35</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup>, 13<sup>19</sup>. (2) Luke also inserts the words into Mk. 1<sup>13</sup>, 3<sup>13</sup>, 9<sup>9</sup>. But in the first two of these cases he may not be following Mark. And, on the other hand, he omits the words occurring in Mk. 1<sup>9</sup> (but here he may not be following Mark), 4<sup>35</sup> (but here he has a similar phrase), 13<sup>19, 24</sup>, 14<sup>25</sup>.

ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (Mt.) preferred to σκιρτήσατε (Lk.). ἀγαλλιᾶω occurs here only in Matthew, and is therefore not likely to be due to the Evangelist. It occurs twice in Luke, and twice in Acts. This is not sufficient to make it appear probable that Luke would have retained it, if it occurred in Q. And σκιρτάω occurs twice in Luke elsewhere, and in matter peculiar to him, viz. 1<sup>41, 44</sup>, and it is found nowhere else in the N.T.

ὅτι (Mt.) preferred to ἰδοὺ γάρ (Lk.). ἰδοὺ γάρ is a characteristic Lucan expression, being found 6 times in Luke and Acts, and never elsewhere in the N.T., except 2 Cor. 7<sup>11</sup>.

ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Mt.) preferred to ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (Lk.) as being the more Jewish expression.

κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν (Lk.) preferred to οὕτω γὰρ ἐδίωξαν (Mt.). Luke uses the same phrase in 6<sup>26</sup>. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ occurs nowhere else in the N.T. (But cf. τὰ αὐτὰ in Acts 15<sup>27</sup>.) It does not seem probable that Luke would have altered an original οὕτω in both verses in favour of an expression which he never uses elsewhere, especially as his opportunities for making a similar change were so numerous. Matthew may have substituted ἐδίωξαν for ἐποιοῦν in order to make the meaning more explicit.

τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν (Lk.) preferred to τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν (Mt.). Luke retains the same



expression in v. 26. The fact that in the Q passage Mt. 23<sup>29f.</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>47f.</sup> the fathers and the prophets are spoken of together may lend some support to the Lucan rendering here. It looks the more original. The Matthaean rendering may be the more rounded form assumed by the words in the course of repetition, and the comparison of the Apostles with the Prophets is one which the First Evangelist might well make more explicit. It does not seem probable that τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν is original as well as οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. The expression would then lose in terseness.

Lk. 6<sup>24-26</sup>. πλήν retained, though a favourite Lucan word, because an adversative particle seems to be required here, and we have no evidence that any other than this is the original.

καὶ διψήσουσι added to correspond with the related Beatitude, and with πενθήσουσι καὶ κλάουσιν of the next Woe.

ὑμῶν added after οὐαί in v. 26, because it seems needed to mark the change to the second person form.

οἱ ἄνθρωποι omitted, as in v. 22.

In the absence of evidence upon which to work, we do not venture to make any other changes in the text of the Woes or to conjecture what Woes in addition to those which Luke gives may have been recorded in Q.

Mt. 5<sup>17</sup>. ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας retained (see what was said on this verse in the last chapter). Matthew uses the expression 'the Law and the Prophets' in 7<sup>12</sup>, 22<sup>40</sup>, where it is absent from the parallels in the other Gospels. But it occurs in Lk. 16<sup>16</sup>, Acts 24<sup>14</sup>, Rom. 3<sup>21</sup>, and was evidently in common use; cf. Lk. 16<sup>29, 31</sup>, 24<sup>44</sup>, Jn. 1<sup>45</sup>. The facts that current Jewish teaching exalted the Law, and largely ignored the prophetic portion of the O.T., and also that our Lord was much more in accord with the prophetic teaching, may explain the absence from the Sermon of any illustrations of the fulfilment of the Prophets.

Mt. 5<sup>22</sup>. εἰκῇ omitted, with the R.V. text. The MSS are fairly evenly balanced. The word is omitted by 8, B, Vulg., Justin, Tert., Origen, Athan., Aug. ('Retract.' 1<sup>19</sup>), Chromatius, Jerome, etc.; it is inserted by D, L, I, 33, Lat. Vet., Syr., Clem. Al., Cyprian, Aug. ('De

Serm. D. in M.'), etc. But it is more likely to have been inserted into the original text than to have been omitted from it. And if Matthew did not write εἰκῆ it is not likely that it occurred in the text of Q.

τοῦ πυρός omitted after εἰς τὴν γέενναν, because (1) it occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Mt. 18<sup>9</sup>, and here it is not found in the parallel Mk. 9<sup>47</sup>; (2) there is no corresponding addition in the case of the preceding τῇ κρίσει and τῷ συνεδρίῳ.

In the absence of evidence we do not venture to make any other changes in the text of the illustrations peculiar to Matthew.

Mt. 5<sup>39a</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>27a</sup>. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν (Mt.) preferred to ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν (Lk.). δέ occurs at each of the five corresponding points in Matthew's previous examples. He uses ἀλλά frequently, and is not likely to have changed an original ἀλλά for δέ.

Nor does it seem probable that τοῖς ἀκούουσιν is original. If the words occurred here, they probably did so in the previous corresponding introductions also. But of this Matthew gives no hint. And there is nothing to which they form a contrast in Matthew's wording of the introductions.

Lk. 6<sup>27a, 28b</sup>. The Matthaean placing of the precepts on love to enemies preferred to the Lucan for the reasons given in the previous chapter.

Mt. 5<sup>34</sup>. ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. As our Lord appears to have generally conformed to Jewish custom in avoiding the direct enunciation of the divine Name, and in substituting for it some word or phrase of current usage (*cf.* Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 194-198, 233), it may be surmised that He did so here. But, if so, one can but conjecture what may have been the expression employed by Him.

Mt. 5<sup>39</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>29a</sup>. ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει (Mt.) preferred to τῷ τύπτοντί σε (Lk.). ῥαπίζειν is rare in Matthew, occurring besides only in 26<sup>67</sup>. It is found nowhere else in the N.T. τύπτειν occurs in three other passages of Luke, and five times in Acts. It is found twice also in Matthew. Besides, whilst Mt. 26<sup>67</sup> has ῥαπίζειν corresponding to the noun ῥάπισμα of Mk. 14<sup>65</sup>, Lk. 22<sup>63</sup> has neither the noun

nor the verb. (It must be remembered, however, that Luke's relation to Mark in the Passion narrative is exceptional.)

The construction of Matthew recurs in *v.* 41 (peculiar to Matthew), and looks more original than the participial construction of Luke (although Matthew also has the participial construction in *vv.* 40 and 42).

δεξιάν σου omitted. On the whole, it seems more probable that Matthew has inserted these words, than that Luke has omitted them. It is noticeable that Matthew has δεξιός in *5*<sup>29, 30</sup>, whilst it is not found in Mk. *9*<sup>43-48</sup>; but it is not possible to judge whether Matthew has added the word to Q, or whether he found it in Q. But Luke has added δεξιός in his parallels to Mk. *3*<sup>1</sup> and *14*<sup>47</sup>. The only parallel to Mark where he omits it is that to Mk. *16*<sup>5</sup>. It is the left cheek which the smiter would naturally strike first, using his right hand.

εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα (Mt.) looks more original than ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα (Lk.).

στρέψον αὐτῷ (Mt.) preferred to παρέχε (Lk.). The latter is the better Greek. παρέχειν is a characteristic word of Luke, whilst στρέφειν occurs in his Gospel only in the participial form στραφείς, and is found in Acts but three times (Acts *7*<sup>39, 42</sup>, *13*<sup>46</sup>), one of which occurs in a quotation.

Mt. *5*<sup>40</sup> = Lk. *6*<sup>29b</sup>. Matthew preferred. The reference to a process of law seems to bear the mark of originality. It is easier to understand the change of the saying from the Matthaean form into a general maxim as in Luke than the reverse process.

The other changes follow from this, viz. μὴ κωλύσῃς for ἄφες, αἴρειν for λαμβάνειν, and the placing of ἱμάτιον before χιτῶν. Luke is describing an act of violence in which the outer cloak would be first snatched away. But, in a process of law, the under garment, as the less valuable and noticeable, might well be first taken.

Mt. *5*<sup>42</sup> = Lk. *6*<sup>30</sup>. τῷ αἰτοῦντι preferred to παντὶ αἰτοῦντι. πᾶς is a favourite word of Luke. He often inserts it into the matter which he draws from Mark; cf., e.g., Mk. *2*<sup>14</sup> with Lk. *5*<sup>28</sup>, Mk. *3*<sup>5</sup> with Lk. *6*<sup>10</sup>, Mk. *5*<sup>38</sup> with Lk. *8*<sup>52</sup>, Mk. *6*<sup>7</sup> with Lk. *9*<sup>1</sup>, Mk. *6*<sup>14</sup> with Lk. *9*<sup>7</sup>,

Mk. 6<sup>37</sup> with Luke 9<sup>13</sup>, Mk. 8<sup>34</sup> with Lk. 9<sup>23</sup>, Mk. 10<sup>21</sup> with Lk. 18<sup>22</sup>, Mk. 14<sup>61</sup> with Lk. 22<sup>70</sup>, Mk. 15<sup>41</sup> with Lk. 23<sup>49</sup>. It is very common in Acts, and in the matter of Luke peculiar to him. He may well, therefore, have inserted it here.

On the other side, however, it should be noticed that Matthew also often uses the word, and frequently inserts it into his Marcan matter.

τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς (Mt.) preferred to ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σά μὴ ἀπαίτει (Lk.).

δανείζειν occurs here only in Matthew. Its occurrence three times in Lk. 6<sup>34, 35</sup>, which we omit from Q's Sermon, may be in favour of it having stood here in Q. Luke has used ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος in v. 29, where it seemed not to be original. Here it repeats the same command as in v. 29 (only now given in a general form), whilst Matthew introduces a new idea.

τὰ σά is probably not original. Matthew has the definite article followed by a personal pronoun in four passages peculiar to him, viz. 20<sup>14, 15</sup>, 25<sup>25, 27</sup> (unless we regard the Parables of the Talents and the Pounds as from the same source). It is perhaps also worth noticing that Lk. 22<sup>42</sup> reads τὸ σόν for τί σὺ of Mk. 14<sup>36</sup>. ἀπαιτεῖν is found only here and in Lk 12<sup>20</sup> in the N.T. It may have been suggested by the αἰτοῦντι of the previous clause.

Mt. 7<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>31</sup>. Luke's placing of the Golden Rule preferred. In Matthew it stands between passages which occur in Luke's great Interpolation, and to which it does not appear to be related. Matthew seems to have reserved it for what he regards as the climax of his Discourse, immediately preceding the concluding exhortation. In Luke, on the other hand, it occurs in the midst of teaching upon our duty to others. But it is not sufficiently appropriate to its context to make insertion likely.

καὶ καθὼς θέλετε (Lk.) preferred to πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε (Mt.). It does not seem likely that Luke would omit πᾶς, if it were original. Matthew is rather fond of οὖν, and may well have inserted it. ὅσος ἔν (or ἐάν) occurs 6 times in Matthew, only twice in Mark, and once in Luke. καθὼς is not a favourite word of Matthew. Of



the 8 occurrences in Mark, Matthew has but three, and these are the only occurrences in his Gospel. The word is indeed rather a favourite of Luke, occurring 10 times in matter peculiar to him. But there is only one case where Luke has introduced καθώς into matter parallel to Mark, viz. Lk. 5<sup>14</sup> = Mk. 1<sup>44</sup> (here Mark reads &). And of the 8 occurrences in Mark, Luke reproduces only two.

οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς (Mt.) preferred to καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως (Lk.). Luke is fond of ὁμοίως. He has it 11 times in the Gospel, whilst Matthew has it only 3 times, and Mark only twice. Matthew looks here more original.

οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται (Mt.) omitted. Luke has this expression for the whole O.T. revelation in 16<sup>16</sup>, and a similar one in 24<sup>44</sup>. It is not, therefore, improbable that, had it stood here in Q, he would have retained it.

Matthew has introduced the words into a context drawn from Mark; cf. Mk. 12<sup>31</sup> with Mt. 22<sup>40</sup>. He may well, therefore, have appended them to an utterance which in his Discourse appears to hold a climactic position, at the close of its didactic matter. And it is possible that their occurrence in Mt. 5<sup>17</sup> may have suggested to him the addition of them here.

Mt. 5<sup>44</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>28</sup>. διωκόντων (Mt.) preferred to ἐπηρεαζόντων (Lk.). The latter occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in 1 Peter 3<sup>16</sup>, and never in the LXX. It is more classical than διωκόντων in the sense here intended, and is therefore less likely to be the original.

Mt. 5<sup>45</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>35b</sup>. ὅπως γένησθε (Mt.) preferred to καὶ ἔσεσθε (Lk.). The Lucan version may be due to the previous clause, καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς, which we have not included in the text of Q's Sermon. It is true that Luke uses the verb γίνεσθαι more frequently than Matthew, but he uses ὅπως much less frequently. It occurs 17 times in Matthew, and 7 times in Luke. In Acts it is found 15 times.

τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς (Mt.) preferred to τοῦ ὑψίστου (Lk.). The former was a popular Jewish expression (cf. Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 184 ff.).

Although it is characteristic of Matthew, it occurs once in Mark, viz. in 11<sup>25</sup>, and Luke has ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in 11<sup>13</sup>. It seems probable that it stood in Q. (*Cf.* what was said above on ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.) ὕψιστος is one of Luke's characteristic words. As a name of God it occurs five times in Luke and twice in Acts. Elsewhere in the N.T. it is found twice only, viz. in Mk. 5<sup>7</sup> and Heb. 7<sup>1</sup>, the latter being a quotation from the LXX. There is good ground for thinking that ὕψις did not belong to the popular speech. It is put into our Lord's mouth in this passage only. Probably, then, the expression υἱοὶ τοῦ ὕψιστου is due to Luke's personal predilection. Possibly he had in mind the words υἱοὶ ὕψιστου of Ps. 82<sup>6</sup> LXX (although there the sense of the expression is different, indicating the exalted rank of those so entitled); *cf.* Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 198-199.

ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους (Mt.) preferred to ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς (Lk.).

Matthew's version is the more picturesque. The allusions to nature are in keeping with Christ's teaching elsewhere; *cf.*, *e.g.*, the references in Mt. 6<sup>25-34</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>22-31</sup> to the birds, the lilies, and the grass of the field. Also, our Lord seems to have been fond of using illustrations in pairs—*e.g.* the widows in the days of Elijah and the lepers in those of Elisha in the sermon at Nazareth of Lk. 4<sup>20-30</sup>. Luke's version rather has the look of being a reduced paraphrase of the original. It does not seem probable that Q contained a combination of the two versions.

Mt. 5<sup>46</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>32</sup>. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε (Mt.) preferred to καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε (Lk.). Luke has καὶ ἐὰν in v. 33. He may have written εἰ here to avoid the repetition of ἐὰν, and he may have put καὶ for γὰρ because he has γὰρ in the latter part of v. 32.

τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε (Mt.) preferred to ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ (Lk.). χάρις is one of Luke's favourite words. It occurs twenty-five times in Luke and Acts. μισθός is the more Jewish term. It is noticeable that Luke uses μισθός in the clause of v. 35a, καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθός ὑμῶν πολὺς, which is part of the matter peculiar to him.

οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι (Mt.) preferred to καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσι (Lk.).

καὶ γὰρ is somewhat characteristic of Luke. It occurs 9 times in the Gospel. The rhetorical question looks original, and Luke has in many instances either changed Mark's questions into statements or omitted them; οἱ τελῶναι looks more original than the more general expression οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ: and Luke is fond of the word ἁμαρτωλός. (It occurs 17 times in Luke, 5 times in Matthew, 6 times in Mark.) In view of the frequency with which the words τελώνης and ἁμαρτωλός are coupled together in the Gospels, it might be thought that they both stood here in Q. But the parallelism between the question here and that in the next verse of Matthew seems to make this less probable. The phrase τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι of Matthew looks more original than the fuller expression of Luke. Luke has Matthew's expression in v. 33.

Mt. 5<sup>47</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>33</sup>. καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον (Mt.) preferred to καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῇτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιῶντας ὑμᾶς (Lk.).

It is intelligible that Luke may have substituted another word for ἀσπάζεσθαι, because the full significance to a Jew of a salutation might not be realised by some of his Gentile readers. It is not so intelligible that Matthew should have substituted ἀσπάζεσθαι for an original ἀγαθοποιεῖν. Besides, in several instances Luke appears to have substituted for the original a word exegetical of it; cf., e.g., ἀγαθά (Mt. 7<sup>11</sup>) with πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Lk. 11<sup>13</sup>); μάχαιραν (Mt. 10<sup>34</sup>) with διαμερισμόν (Lk. 12<sup>51</sup>); γραμματεῖς (Mt. 23<sup>34</sup>) with ἀποστόλους (Lk. 11<sup>49</sup>).

If ἀσπάσησθε is original, it follows that τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν is probably original too. μόνον also is probably original. Luke uses it but once in his Gospel.

τὸ περισσὸν ποιεῖτε (Mt.) preferred to ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ (Lk.). It looks more original, with its rugged terseness. And (as we have already noted) χάρις is a characteristic word of Luke.

οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν (Mt.) preferred to καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι (Lk.). Cf. what was said on the corresponding words in the previous verse.

ἐθνικός nowhere occurs in Luke's writings. If Luke found it here in his source, he would be likely to substitute for it another word, out of regard for his Gentile readers.

Mt. 5<sup>48</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>36</sup>. οὖν omitted. There is some textual evidence in favour of οὖν here in Luke, but the best MSS omit it. If Luke did not write οὖν, it seems more probable that Matthew has inserted it than that Luke has omitted it. For Matthew seems to regard this verse as the climactic and concluding utterance, not merely of the preceding verses on love to enemies, but also of at least the whole section from v. 21.

οἰκτίρων (Lk.) preferred to τέλειος (Mt.). It cannot be said that our Lord is more likely to have bidden His disciples to be merciful than to be perfect. The precept to be perfect would only be an instance of His characteristic hyperbolism. But there are reasons for preferring Luke's word here.

(1) τέλειος is not inappropriate to the context, but οἰκτίρων does not connect naturally with either the preceding or the following matter. Like ἐλεήμων, οἰκτίρων denotes pity or compassion for those in distress. But it is not the divine pity which is appealed to as an example to men in the preceding reference to God. It is the fact that He does not confine His benefits to the good and the righteous. And in the following passage about judging, it is not the duty of showing pity or compassion towards sufferers which is enforced, but that of entertaining a charitable and forgiving spirit towards our fellows. It does not, therefore, seem probable that Luke would substitute οἰκτίρων for an original τέλειος.

(2) Matthew, who from this point inserts matter from elsewhere (if we are right in thinking that Mt. 6<sup>1-18</sup> as well as 6<sup>19-34</sup> was not in Q's Sermon), may have made the precept more general with a view to its relevancy to the preceding context, and to add to its weight as a climactic utterance. We have evidence of his regard for such climactic sayings in his probable transposition of the Golden Rule from its context in Q to a later position in the Sermon. And we have seen reason to think that he has also altered the Q form of this saying to make it more impressive and forcible.



It is possible that the substitution of the one word for the other was facilitated, if it was not suggested, by the Evangelist's recollection of Ps. 18<sup>25</sup> (With the merciful thou wilt shew thyself merciful; with the perfect man thou wilt shew thyself perfect). It is also possible that these variants derive from two differing readings of the Aramaic text of Q. For the Aramaic word for 'perfect' is ܡܬܟܝܡ, and the word 'merciful' may be rendered by the very similar word ܡܬܠܡܝܠ or ܡܬܠܡܝܠ. Another possibility is that the Aramaic answered to the Hebrew רַב־חֶסֶד, 'abounding in mercy,' and, containing the idea of perfection as well as of mercy, could be rendered by either of the two Greek words.

Probably, then, we may also follow Luke in reading γίνεσθε, although it is less Jewish than ἔσεσθε, and although Luke is fond of γενέσθαι. Here γίνεσθε corresponds with ἔπως γένησθε in Mt. 5<sup>45</sup>, which we have followed.

But Matthew's ὑμεῖς seems to be original; cf. the emphatic καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε in the Golden Rule above.

ὁ οὐράνιος retained. Like πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς above, πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος was a popular Jewish expression in Christ's time. It is likely therefore to have stood in Q.

καθώς (Lk.) preferred to ὡς (Mt.). See on the Golden Rule above (pp. 111, 112), the only other place in the Sermon matter where καθώς occurs.

*Note.*—In the last illustration of 'fulfilment' we have followed the Matthaean order. Lk. 6<sup>35b</sup> cannot stand where it is apart from vv. 34 and 35a. And there seems no reason to suspect the originality of Matthew's order throughout this section.

Mt. 7<sup>1</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>37</sup>. The textual evidence favours the reading καὶ before μὴ κρίνετε in Lk. 6<sup>37</sup>. If Luke wrote καὶ here, he probably drew it from Q. For the reasons for so thinking see pp. 92, 93.

καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε (Lk.) preferred to ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε (Mt.). Luke repeats his construction 4 times. And the construction with ἵνα would be less suitable to the fourth, viz. δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Mt. 7<sup>2</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>38</sup>. ἐν ᾧ (Mt.) preferred to ᾧ (Lk.), because it is more Jewish.

μετρηθήσεται (Mt.) preferred to ἀντιμετρηθήσεται (Lk.). Luke is fond of verbs compounded with prepositions.

Mt. 15<sup>14</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>39</sup>. ἐμπεσοῦνται (Lk.) preferred to πεσοῦνται (Mt.). It is natural to regard Matthew as original here also, for the reason just given. But Matthew uses ἐμπίπτειν in a similar connexion in 12<sup>11</sup>. It seems therefore more prudent to retain Luke's word.

Luke's interrogative form of these two sayings preferred to Matthew's. As already noticed (on Mt. 5<sup>46</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>32</sup>), Luke has often changed Mark's questions into statements, or omitted them. The presumption therefore is that Luke is not himself responsible for the interrogatives here.

Mt. 10<sup>24, 25</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>40</sup>. οὐδὲ δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ (Mt.) retained. Such parallelism is Jewish, and frequent in Q.

ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ (Mt.) preferred to κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ (Lk.). If Q had two parallel negative clauses, as in Mt. 10<sup>24</sup>, it is probable that it contained two parallel positive clauses also, as in Mt. 10<sup>25</sup>, to balance them.

Matthew's wording preferred, because πᾶς is a Lucan word, and the participle κατηρτισμένος, although Luke does not use it elsewhere, seems more likely to be Lucan than to derive from Q. Moreover, καταρτίζω is a surgical word, used of setting a bone or a joint.

Mt. 7<sup>3</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>41</sup>. τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκόν (Mt.) preferred to τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ (Lk.). Luke is fond of ἴδιος. It occurs 17 times in Acts and 6 times in Luke. He is not fond of σός, which occurs 3 times in Acts, and 4 times in Luke. Matthew has no apparent fondness for σός. It occurs 6 times in Matthew.

Mt. 7<sup>4</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>42a</sup>. ἐρεῖς (Mt.) preferred to δύνασαι λέγειν (Lk.). It looks more original, and ἡ πῶς ἐρεῖς forms a closer parallel to τί δὲ βλέπεις above.

ἀδελφέ (Lk.) omitted. The vocative is nowhere used in Matthew or Mark. Luke, on the other hand, often uses the vocative plural in Acts, and the singular in Acts 9<sup>17</sup>, 21<sup>10</sup>, 22<sup>13</sup>. Cf. the more frequent use of the vocative

διδάσκαλε in Luke than in Matthew or Mark. (It occurs in Matthew 6 times, in Mark 10 times, in Luke 12 times.)

ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ (Mt.) preferred to τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ (Lk.). The parallelism is thus less close with τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου above, but Luke is fond of using the definite article with words inserted between the article and the noun (*cf.* Hawkins, 'Horae Syn.' p. 50). And Matthew and Luke agree in using ἐκ in Mt. 7<sup>5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>42b</sup>.

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου (Mt.) preferred to αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων (Lk.). It is more Jewish, in wording and construction.

Mt. 7<sup>5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>42b</sup>. ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ (Mt.) preferred to τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ (Lk.). See above on Mt. 7<sup>4</sup>.

Mt. 7<sup>16, 18</sup>, 12<sup>33-35</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>43-45</sup>. Luke's order preferred. If Matthew has shown freedom in dealing with this Q matter by transferring some of it to his twelfth chapter, and by compiling in this passage of the Sermon, he may well have also modified the order of Q. On the other hand, there seems no reason for suspecting that Luke has here changed the order of Q.

Mt. 7<sup>18</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>43</sup>; *cf.* Mt. 12<sup>33</sup>. δένδρον καλόν (Lk.) preferred to δένδρον ἀγαθόν (Mt.). It is supported by Mt. 12<sup>33</sup>. Matthew may have used ἀγαθόν under the influence of its occurrence in the adjacent matter, Mt. 12<sup>35</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>45</sup>.

οὐ δύναται . . . ποιεῖν (Mt.) preferred to οὐ γάρ ἐστι . . . ποιοῦν (Lk.). Luke is fond of periphrastic tenses; *cf.* the statistics given in Hawkins, 'Horae Syn.' p. 51. Luke uses this construction so much oftener than Matthew or Mark that he may not improbably have introduced it here.

γάρ omitted. Mt. 12<sup>33-35</sup> supports Luke in reading γάρ twice in Lk. 6<sup>44-45</sup>. Neither Mt. 7<sup>18</sup> nor Mt. 12<sup>33</sup> supports γάρ at the beginning of Lk. 6<sup>43</sup>. It appears more probable that Luke has added the word, than that Matthew has omitted it, especially if Luke has otherwise altered the beginning of the sentence.

καρπὸν σαπρόν (Lk.) preferred to καρποὺς πονηροὺς (Mt.). Matthew uses the singular noun throughout 12<sup>33</sup>. This also supports the singular in Lk. 6<sup>44</sup>. The plural in

Mt. 7<sup>16-18</sup> & 20 may be due to the influence of the plural subject of Mt. 7<sup>15</sup> (viz. the false prophets).

σαπρός preferred, because it is supported by Mt. 12<sup>33</sup>, and because Matthew is fond of πονηρός. He may have used it here under the influence of its occurrence in the immediately following matter, viz. Mt. 12<sup>35</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>45</sup>.

πάλιν (Lk.) retained. The textual evidence for it in Luke is strong. If it is the true text of Luke, it appears probable that it comes from Q, for Luke has πάλιν only twice elsewhere in his Gospel, and Matthew has omitted it from several Marcan contexts.

Mt. 12<sup>33</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>44a</sup>; cf. Mt. 7<sup>16a</sup>. ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται (Mt.) preferred to ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται (Lk.). Mt. 7<sup>16</sup> supports Mt. 12<sup>33</sup> against Luke in order, and in omitting ἕκαστος and ἴδιος. ἕκαστος is similar to πᾶς, of which Luke is fond, and which he inserts into his Marcan matter (cf. above on Mt. 5<sup>42</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>30</sup>). If ἕκαστος is omitted, ἴδιος is also probably an insertion by Luke. Matthew may have modified the text of Q in 7<sup>16</sup>, because of the matter in the preceding verse.

Mt. 7<sup>16b</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>44b</sup>. μήτι συλλέγουσιν (Mt.) preferred to οὐ γὰρ συλλέγουσι (Lk.). The rhetorical question looks original, and Luke has changed many of Mark's questions into statements.

ἐκ (Lk.) preferred to ἀπό (Mt.). The ἀπό here in Matthew may be due to the ἀπό at the beginning of the verse.

τρίβολος (Mt.) preferred to βάτος (Lk.), as being the less choice expression; and the plural (Mt.) preferred to the singular (Lk.) because of the parallelism with ἀκανθῶν.

τρυγῶσι (Lk.) omitted. The addition might suggest itself to Luke owing to the change which he makes in the form of this saying (if, as we think, the interrogative form is original). For it might seem to him that the style would be improved by the insertion of a verb to balance συλλέγουσιν in the previous clause. The word is classical, and is specially used of the vintage. It is therefore such a word as Luke, with his command of Greek, might insert. Moreover, the distinction between συλλέγειν of the gathering of figs, and



τρυγᾶν of that of grapes, is a nice though appropriate one, and one on that account perhaps less likely to be original.

If Luke has inserted τρυγῶσι, and made other alterations in this verse, he has probably also changed the order of the words 'figs' and 'grapes.'

Mt. 12<sup>34b, 35</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>45</sup>. τῆς καρδίας (Lk.) retained, although the word is one of which Luke is rather fond. Matthew's omission here may be due to the occurrence of καρδία in the previous sentence of his matter, which differs in order from Luke.

ἐκβάλλει (Mt.) preferred to προφέρει (Lk.), which has the appearance of being one of Luke's linguistic improvements.

τὸ ἀγαθόν and τὸ πονηρόν (Lk.) preferred to ἀγαθά and πονηρά (Mt.). The singular forms a closer parallel to καρπόν, which we have adopted in preference to καρπούς. The plural form may have been suggested to Matthew by his use of both words in the plural in v. 34a.

ἄνθρωπος (after ὁ πονηρὸς) and θησαυροῦ (after ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ) (Mt.) retained. Their absence from Luke has the appearance of being an improvement of style and an abbreviation.

τοῦ (before περισσεύματος) and τῆς (before καρδίας) (Mt.) retained for the same reason.

αὐτοῦ after στόμα retained. Matthew's omission of the word is required by the context in which he places this saying.

Mt. 7<sup>21</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>46</sup>. Luke's interrogative form preferred. As previously noticed, Luke has changed many interrogative sayings of Mark into statements. The only instances of the reverse change in Luke (*i.e.* of a statement in Mark into a question) appear to be Lk. 21<sup>7</sup>, *cf.* Mk. 13<sup>4</sup>; and Lk. 22<sup>27</sup>, *cf.* Mk. 10<sup>45</sup> : *cf.* also the insertion of τί ποιήσω in Lk. 20<sup>13</sup>, and of the questions in Lk. 22<sup>48-49</sup>.

Matthew's version does not seem to afford any substantial evidence of a more original form of the saying than the Lucan. τί δέ μοι λέγετε might seem to have a better claim to originality than τί δέ με καλεῖτε, but in view of the use of λέγειν at the end of the saying this scarcely seems probable. So, too, Matthew's 'the will of my Father' might seem to have a better claim to originality than Luke's

'the things which I say.' But the reference to Christ's words in both versions of the following parable seems to point to the originality of Luke's version. It is possible that Matthew has modified the form of the saying in the direction of Mt. 5<sup>20</sup>. The following instances of the repetition in Matthew of a saying in the same or a similar form may be compared: 7<sup>16a</sup> and 7<sup>20</sup>, 19<sup>30</sup> and 20<sup>16</sup>, 24<sup>42</sup> and 25<sup>13</sup>. It is also possible that Matthew has given the saying an eschatological turn to adapt it to the eschatological saying which follows in Mt. 7<sup>22-23</sup>.

Mt. 7<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>47</sup>. οὖν (Mt.) omitted. Cf. above on Mt. 5<sup>48</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>36</sup> and Mt. 7<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>31</sup>. These are parallel cases of the occurrence of οὖν at the beginning of an utterance which appears to be regarded as climactic.

Matthew's version, ὅστις ἀκούει . . . καὶ ποιεῖ . . . ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε preferred to Luke's ἀκούων . . . καὶ ποιῶν . . . οἰκοδομοῦντι. The latter is more idiomatic Greek, and therefore less likely to be original. Luke often uses participles. A similar difference of construction occurs elsewhere; cf., e.g., Mt. 5<sup>39-41</sup> with Lk. 6<sup>29</sup>. There, however, as here, both versions agree in having the participial construction in the next sentence.

ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με (Lk.). Although Luke has nothing corresponding to these words in v. 49, it appears probable that they are based on Q. If so, ὅστις ἔρχεται πρὸς με may have been the original.

τῶν λόγων (Lk.) preferred to τοὺς λόγους (Mt.). The only other instances in Luke of the use of the *gen. rei* with ἀκούειν seem to be Acts 7<sup>34</sup>, 9<sup>7</sup>, 11<sup>7</sup>, 22<sup>7</sup>. In Acts 7<sup>34</sup> the passage is a quotation from Ex. 3<sup>7</sup>, where the LXX reads καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα. Thus Luke may well have drawn his construction here from his source. The other instances, viz. Acts 9<sup>7</sup>, 11<sup>7</sup>, 22<sup>7</sup>, occur in the three accounts of St. Paul's conversion, and in connexion with the voice from heaven. As φωνή here stands for the divine Speaker, they are hardly true instances of the *gen. rei*. On the other hand, Luke frequently uses the *accus. rei* with ἀκούειν, and in a number of instances the same word λόγους (or λόγον) as here (cf. Lk. 5<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>39</sup>, 11<sup>28</sup>, Acts 1<sup>22</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>4</sup>, 24, 10<sup>44</sup>, 13<sup>7, 44</sup>, 15<sup>7</sup>, 19<sup>10</sup>).

It therefore appears probable that in writing the genitive λόγων here, Luke reproduced his source.

τούτους (Mt.). It seems probable that this word (in the genitive) stood in Q, connecting the following illustration especially with the words of the Sermon. If so, Luke may have omitted it because the two genitives μου and τούτων seemed to him to make the phrase cumbrous.

ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἔστιν ὅμοιος (Lk.) retained. Luke has a similar clause in 12<sup>5a</sup> which is not represented in Matthew. It is difficult to decide whether or not probability inclines to these being Lucan insertions.

(1) On the one hand, Luke has inserted clauses of similar purport, viz. to throw emphasis on the words which follow, in 9<sup>44</sup> and 20<sup>13</sup> into matter which he appears to have drawn from Mark. And ὑποδεικνύναι occurs 3 times in Luke, twice in Acts, and only in Mt. 3<sup>7</sup> besides in the N.T.

(2) On the other hand, Luke has not made insertions of this kind into matter drawn from Mark, in cases where he had the opportunity of doing so, e.g. in Lk. 8<sup>20-21</sup>, 22<sup>25b-27</sup>. And both Matthew and Luke agree in using ὑποδεικνύναι in their account of the Baptist's preaching, Mt. 3<sup>7</sup> = Lk. 3<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, it may be thought probable that words of similar purport to the frequent 'Verily I say unto you' would be likely to occur in the closing sentences of the Discourse.

On the whole, it seems safer to retain the words. In this case ὁμοίός ἐστιν (Lk.) is naturally preferred to ὁμοιωθήσεται (Mt.).

ἀνθρώπῳ (Lk.) preferred to ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ . . . μαρῶ (Mt.). ἀνὴρ is one of Luke's characteristic words (Mt. 8 times, Mk. 4 times, Lk. 27 times, Acts 100 times). It is not likely that he would have substituted ἄνθρωπος for it, if it were original. φρόνιμος and μαρὸς are both words characteristic of Matthew (φρόνιμος occurs in Matthew 7 times, in Luke twice, not at all in Mark and Acts; μαρὸς occurs in Matthew 6 times, not at all in Mark, Luke, or Acts). Matthew may have introduced them here in order to make the contrast more explicit. We have previously noticed that this motive seems to be implied by some of the changes which he has made in his Marcan matter.

ὃς ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε, καὶ ἔθηκε θεμέλιον (Lk.). The wording here is suspiciously Lucan (σκάπτειν occurs 3 times in Luke, not elsewhere in the N.T.; βαθύνειν here only in the N.T.; τιθέναι 5 times in Matthew, 12 times in Mark, 15 times in Luke, and 23 times in Acts. θεμέλιος 3 times in Luke, once in Acts, not at all in Matthew or Mark). And the corresponding words in the description below of the foolish builder seem to render the originality of καὶ ἔθηκε θεμέλιον improbable. For there, Matthew's ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον looks decidedly more original than Luke's ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμέλιου. It is more terse and forceful, and ἄμμον seems to be the word needed to contrast with πέτραν. Reading ἄμμον, the addition of χωρὶς θεμέλιου seems unnecessary, and is probably not original. But if we exclude the words from the description of the foolish builder, it seems improbable that the corresponding words, καὶ ἔθηκε θεμέλιον, are original in the description of the wise builder. They may be derived from the words τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν which Matthew records below in v. 25, and which seem more original than Luke's διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομῆσθαι αὐτήν.

But the graphic ὃς ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε of Luke looks original in substance, and it is matter of a kind which Matthew more frequently omits from Mark than Luke inserts into him. To confine our attention to the sayings of Christ, and to cases where Luke reproduces the Marcan words which Matthew omits, we may note as illustrations the following Matthaean omissions:—in Mt. 9<sup>17</sup> of 'the new from the old'; in 12<sup>4</sup> of 'and gave also to those that were with him'; in 13<sup>22</sup> of εἰσπορευόμενοι; in 20<sup>19</sup> of καὶ ἐμπύσουσιν αὐτῷ; and in 26<sup>18</sup> of the predictions that the disciples would meet a man having a pitcher of water, and that he would show them a large upper room furnished.

We conclude therefore as probable that at least the substance of ὃς ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε, if not the identical words, stood in Q.

τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ (Mt.) preferred to οἰκίαν (Lk.) here and below in Mt. 7<sup>26</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>49</sup>. Luke's reading looks like a shortening of the original.



Mt. 7<sup>25</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>48b</sup>. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ κ.τ.λ. . . . τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν (Mt.) preferred to πλημμύρας δὲ γενομένης κ.τ.λ. . . . διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομηθῆσαι αὐτήν (Lk.).

Matthew's description of the rain, the flood, and the wind is more graphic than Luke's version. The late word βροχὴ seems more likely to have stood in Q than the more classical πλήμμυρα. And the simplicity of the construction in Matthew favours its originality. The singular ὁ ποταμός in Luke looks like an alteration of an original plural, and this change may well have led Luke to alter the verb προσέπεσον to προσέρρηξεν. ἰσχύειν is a verb of which Luke is fond (in Matthew 4 times, in Mark 4 times, in Luke 8 times, in Acts 6 times). So is σαλεύειν (in Matthew twice, in Mark once, in Luke 4 times, in Acts 4 times).

Mt. 7<sup>26</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>49a</sup>. ἀκούων . . . ποιῶν (Mt.) preferred to ἀκούσας . . . ποιήσας (Lk.). The aorist is more correct, and therefore probably less original. As both versions agree in having participles, we suppose that they are original here, and not the construction of ὅστις with the indicative, as in Mt. 7<sup>24</sup>.

πᾶς . . . μου τῶν λόγων τούτων . . . and αὐτούς after ποιῶν (Mt.) retained. If they occurred in Q as in Mt. 7<sup>24</sup>, it seems probable that they would be repeated here. As we preferred the genitive τῶν λόγων τούτων there, we retain it here, although it is not supported by Luke.

ὁμοίός ἐστιν and ἀνθρώπῳ (Lk.) preferred to ὁμοιωθήσεται and ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ (Mt.) as above.

ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε (Mt.) preferred to οἰκοδομήσαντι (Lk.). If ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε is the original reading above in the description of the wise builder, it seems probable that it is the original reading here also.

ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον (Mt.) preferred to ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου (Lk.). See above on Mt. 7<sup>24</sup>.

Mt. 7<sup>27</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>49b</sup>. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ . . . καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ (Mt.) preferred to ἥ προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμός (Lk.). See on the corresponding words above in Mt. 7<sup>25</sup>. προσέκοψαν (Mt.) retained. The simplest explanation of the change from προσέπεσον in v. 25 above seems to be that Matthew is following his source.

καὶ εὐθὺς ἔπεσε preferred. Luke is fond of compound

verbs, and often changes simple verbs into compound in matter drawn from Mark.

Luke's εὐθύς, however, seems to be original. It is a distinct Aramaism (*cf.* Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 28, 29). Luke uses the word here only in his Gospel, and only once in Acts. Thus as he has omitted every εὐθύς which he found in Mark, it does not seem probable that he would have inserted it here without authority. Matthew also has omitted so many of the occurrences of the word in Mark that there is no improbability in supposing that, if original, he has omitted it here also.

καὶ ἦν ἡ πτωστὴς αὐτῆς μεγάλη (Mt.) preferred to καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα (Lk.). καὶ ἐγένετο is a very characteristic expression of Luke, and a distinct Hebraism (*cf.* Dalman, 'Words of Jesus,' pp. 32, 33). Luke's τὸ ῥῆγμα may have been suggested to him by his use of the verb προσρηγνύναι above.

Mt.	MATTHEW (R.V. Text)	Q	Reconstructed Q Text I	LUKE (R.V. Text)	Lk 6
c. 5, v. 3	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	1	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.	20
" "	μακάριοι οἱ πενθῶντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρα- κληθήσονται.	2	μακάριοι οἱ πρῆεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονο- μήσουσι τὴν γῆν.	μακάριοι οἱ πενθῶντες νῦν, ὅτι χορησθή- σεσθε.	21
" "	μακάριοι οἱ πράεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονο- μήσουσι τὴν γῆν.	3	μακάριοι οἱ πενῶντες καὶ διψῶντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.	μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε.	
" "	μακάριοι οἱ πενθῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.	4	μακάριοι οἱ πενθῶντες καὶ κλαίοντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται.		
" "	μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεη- θήσονται.	5	μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεη- θήσονται.		
" "	μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ· ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται.	6	μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ· ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὄψονται.		
" "	μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί· ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται.	7	μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί· ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται.		
" "	μακάριοι οἱ διδωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιο- σύνης· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	8	μακάριοι οἱ δειδιωγμένοι· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἀνέιδωσιν, καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρῶν, ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	22
" "	μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν διώξωσι καὶ ἀγ- γελῶσι, καὶ εἴπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ. χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθε· ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολλὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· οὕτω γὰρ ἔδωξαν τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.	9	χαίrete ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀγαλλιά- σθε· ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολλὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε· ἰδοὺ γὰρ, ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολλὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	23
" "		10			
" "		11	πλὴν οὐαὶ τοῖς πλουσίοις· ὅτι ἀπέχουσι τὴν παρακλήσιν αὐτῶν.	πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουτοῖς, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παρακλήσιν ὑμῶν. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε.	24
" "		12	οὐαὶ τοῖς ἐμπεπλησμένοις· ὅτι πεινά- σουσι καὶ διψήσουσι.	οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.	25
" "		13	οὐαὶ τοῖς γελῶσι, ὅτι πενθήσουσι καὶ κλαύσουσι.		
" "		14	οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι πάντες. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	οὐαί, ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίησαν τοῖς ψευδο- προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	26

## II

C. 5, v. 17	Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.	15	Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.	
" " 21	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐ φονεύσεις, ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·	16	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐ φονεύσεις, ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει·	
" " 22	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, Ῥακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ, Μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ πυρός.	17	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, Ῥακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ, Μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ πυρός.	
" " 27	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Οὐ μοιχεύσεις·	18	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Οὐ μοιχεύσεις·	
" " 28	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	19	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	
" " 33	Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις,	20	Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις,	
" " 34	Οὐκ ἐπιωκῆσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὄρκους σου· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμόσαι ὅλως·	21	Οὐκ ἐπιωκῆσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὄρκους σου· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὁμόσαι ὅλως·	
" " 35	μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστι τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως·	22	μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστι τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως·	
" " 36	μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὁμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι·	23	μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὁμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι·	
" " 37	οὐδ' οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.	24	οὐδ' οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.	
" " 38	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀπὸ ὀδόντος· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ·	25	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀπὸ ὀδόντος· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ·	
" " 39		26		

Ἄλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑμῶν . . . προσευχεσθε.

27a

28b



Mt.	MATTHEW (R.V. Text)	Q	Reconstructed Q Text II—continued	LUKE (R.V. Text)	Lk.6
c. 5, v. 40	ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιάν σου σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·	27	ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τῷ θελοντί σοι κριβῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου	ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπιπρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πᾶρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·	29
" " 41	καὶ τῷ θελοντί σοι κριβῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβείν ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· καὶ	28	λαβεῖν ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἓν, ὕπαγε μετ',	καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κολύσης, παντὶ αἰτούντί σε δίδου· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει.	30
" " 42	αὐτοῦ δύο· τῷ αἰτούντι σε δίδου, καὶ τὸν θελοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀπο- στροφῆς.	29	αὐτοῦ δύο. τῷ αἰτούντι σε δίδου, καὶ τὸν θελοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀπο- στροφῆς.		
c. 7, v. 12	πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν θέλῃτε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς· οὗτος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.	30	Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.	καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.	31
c. 5, v. 43	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίόν σου, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου·	31	Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίόν σου, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου·	καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπᾶσι. καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιήτε τοὺς ἀγαποῦντας ὑμᾶς,	32
" " 44	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διω- κόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γέννησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πα- τρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον	32	ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διω- κόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γέννησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πα- τρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς,	ἀγαθοποιήτε τοὺς ἀγαποῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶ; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρ- τωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι. . . καὶ ἔσσεσθε υἱοὶ τοῦ ὑψίστου· ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν	33
" " 45	ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ	33	αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι; καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃτε τοὺς ἀδελ- φούς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε;	καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς, γένεσθε οἰκτῖρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτῖρμων ἐστὶ.	35 <sup>b</sup>
" " 46	βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι; καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃτε τοὺς ἀδελ- φούς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε;	34	καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελώναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι; καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃτε τοὺς ἀδελφούς	ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς, γένεσθε οἰκτῖρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτῖρμων ἐστὶ.	36
" " 47	φούς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε;	35	φούς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; γένεσθε ὑμεῖς οἰκτῖρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτῖρμων ἐστὶ.		
" " 48	οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ὅς ἐπεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὥς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν	36	οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; γένεσθε ὑμεῖς οἰκτῖρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτῖρμων ἐστὶ.		

Mt.	MATTHEW	Q	Reconstructed Q Text III	LUKE	Lk.6
C. 7, vv. 1, 2	Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κρίθητε· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	37	καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κρίθητε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλόν, πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυνόμενον, δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κρίθητε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλόν, πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυνόμενον, δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	37 38
C. 15, v. 14	ἄφετε αὐτοὺς· ὁδηγοὶ εἰσι τυφλοὶ τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὀδηγῇ, ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται.	39	Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἔμπεσούνται;	Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἔμπεσούνται; οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον· κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.	39b 40
C. 10, v. 24 " " 25	Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐδὲ δούλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ. ἄρκετόν τῳ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δούλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ.	40 41	οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐδὲ δούλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ. ἄρκετόν τῳ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δούλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ.	τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸν κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σφὶ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἡ πῶς εἶπες τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.	41 42
C. 7, v. 3 " " 4 " " 5	Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σφὶ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἡ πῶς εἶπες τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.	42 43 44	τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σφὶ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἡ πῶς εἶπες τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου; καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.	τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σφὶ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἡ πῶς εἶπες τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου; καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.	41 42

Mt.	MATTHEW (R.V. Text)	Q	Reconstructed Q Text IV	LUKE (R.V. Text)	Lk. 6
c. 7, v. 6	Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.	45	Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.		
"	ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσθε αὐτούς. μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὴν, ἢ ἀπὸ τριβύλων σῦκα ;	46	οὐ δύναται δένδρον καλὸν καρπὸν σαπρὸν ποιεῖν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν καλὸν ποιεῖν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται.	οὐ γάρ ἐστι δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν· ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσι σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βιάτου τρυγῶσι σταφυλὴν.	43
"	οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν, οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.	47	μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἐξ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὴν, ἢ ἐκ τριβύλων σῦκα ;		44
c. 12, v. 33	ἡ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον καλὸν καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ καλόν, ἡ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον σαπρὸν καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ σαπρόν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται.				
"	γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν πονηροῖς ὄντες ; ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ.	48	οὐ γὰρ ἐκ καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκβάλλει τὸ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει, τὸ πονηρὸν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.	ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν· ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.	45
"	ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθὰ· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά.				
"					

Mt.	Matthew	Q	Reconstructed Q Text	Lk.
c. 7. 21	οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μου, Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσ- ελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.	49	Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω ;	Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω ;
" 24	πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους, καὶ ποιῇ αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσε· τεθεμελιώθη γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους, καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ, ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσε· καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.	50 51 52 53 54	πᾶς ὅστις ἔρχεται πρὸς με καὶ ἀκούει μου τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ ποιῇ αὐτούς, ὁποδείξω ὑμῖν τίν ἐστιν ὁμοιος· ὁμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ ὅστις ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε καὶ ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσ- έπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσε· τεθεμελιώθη γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων τούτων, καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὁμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔπεσε· καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.	47 48 49



# THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

## CHAPTER IX

### THE SERMON OF Q AND THE HISTORICAL SERMON

OUR critical inquiry would be incomplete if we stopped short at the point we have now reached. There remains for consideration the important question of the relation between Q's Sermon and the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord.

Of some things we may feel reasonably certain. Q's report of the Sermon was very considerably shorter than the actual Discourse, which probably treated at some length, and in a connected way, of the various subjects with which it dealt. The sayings which Q has preserved are those which had stuck in the hearers' memory when others had been forgotten. Probably, then, it is the most arresting utterances that have been recorded.\* The original Sermon, while it contained paradoxes and pithy aphorisms, did not consist solely of such. Probably, too, some of the sayings in Q's account owe their inclusion in part to the circumstances and trials of the early Christians having called forth the remembrance of them and brought them into prominence, *e.g.* the words which have reference to persecution. It is natural to suppose that the early experiences of the Christian communities would lead to a fuller and more detailed record being preserved of some aspects of Christ's teaching than of others. Again, it seems

\* The following facts point in this direction: (1) the last Beatitude, and the passages enjoining non-resistance and love towards enemies, which are conspicuous for their paradoxical character, appear in both reports of the Sermon. The Evangelists, while omitting other Q matter, have retained these sayings. It is natural to suppose that in Q itself there was the same tendency to record matter of a paradoxical nature. (2) These sayings are characterised by comparative fullness of expression. The last Beatitude is much the longest, and the sayings on non-resistance and love to enemies are full in their expression as compared with those relating to the laws of murder and adultery.

probable that the historical Discourse consisted mainly of the enunciation of general principles, and that it contained few specific rules of conduct. For detailed rules are notably absent from our Q text ; yet, had our Lord enunciated such, these would appear more likely to have been remembered and recorded than abstract principles, especially among a people whose tendency was towards an over-literal outward observance.

But there are several questions which call for consideration. (1) Is it reasonable to suppose that all the different sayings of Q's Sermon were part of the historical Discourse ?

(2) Conversely, is it reasonable to exclude from the historical Sermon all the Q matter which appears to have formed no part of Q's Discourse ?

(3) Is there any other matter in the Synoptic tradition which may with any degree of probability be held to have formed part of the historical Discourse ?

(4) Is it reasonable to trust Q's report as giving a fairly reliable presentation of the type of teaching of the original Discourse ?

The answers to these questions largely depend on our conception of the trustworthiness of Q. Now we have neither external nor internal evidence sufficient to enable us to determine with precision the date of Q. But a comparison of its scope and contents with those of Mark makes it appear probable that it is the earlier document of the two.\* There is good reason to regard it as the work of a companion of our Lord. In favour of this stands, not only the testimony of Papias—if his words apply to the document—but also the high estimate of its value and authority which is implied in the large use of it made by both our First and our Third Evangelists, and perhaps also by our Second.

(1) *Was all Q's Sermon Part of the Historical Discourse ?*—It is no doubt conceivable that some sayings placed by the author of Q in the Sermon belong historically to some other occasion. But due allowance must be made for the retentiveness of Oriental memories, and for the

\* On this see Streeter in *Studies in the Syn. Problem*, pp. 210 ff.

promise of our Lord that the Spirit should bring to the Apostles' remembrance all that He had said to them.<sup>a</sup> Nor must it be forgotten that, in the period between the lifetime of Christ and the writing of Q, His sayings were preserved by oral tradition, and also perhaps by early written records. Certainly, an examination of Q does not seem to show signs of conscious and deliberate compilation such as we see in Matthew. If we regard the looseness of the collection as betokening the author's ignorance of the context to which many of the sayings which he records historically belonged, the fact that a large proportion of the sayings in Q are indefinitely located may add to the probability that, where sayings are assigned to a definite occasion, Q is to be trusted. For it would seem as though the author were unwilling to place a saying in a definite connexion unless he had good reason for doing so. But we cannot safely infer from the looseness and incoherence of Q's matter that its author was ignorant of the occasions to which it historically belongs. It is possible that the detached sayings would have needed a considerable amount of narrative to place them in their historical setting (*cf.* those embedded in the story of the Centurion's Servant), and that the author, though he knew the circumstances which called them forth, yet preferred to record the sayings alone, without their attendant narratives. He may have deemed it unnecessary to insert narrative which did not in any way elucidate the meaning of the sayings which he recorded. Thus his knowledge may have been far greater than what his document discloses. That any of the sayings which Q attributes to our Lord are not authentic seems, in view of our general conception of Q's trustworthiness, to be highly improbable. It might no doubt be plausibly argued that some sayings of which He was not the author have been put into His mouth, and influences might be suggested to lend support to this supposition; *e.g.* it might be urged that the Sermon sayings on the subject of swearing have been drawn from the Epistle of James. But to admit any such hypothesis is to abandon all sense of the trustworthiness of Q.

From these considerations we infer that it would be

<sup>a</sup> Jn. 14<sup>26</sup>.

arbitrary to rule out from the historical Sermon any of Q's Sermon matter, unless very strong reasons presented themselves for so doing. And such there do not appear to be. It is true that some of this matter is loosely connected; but it is not impossible to conjecture teaching such as would supply natural transitions between the different utterances recorded, and constitute the whole into a coherent and well-ordered Discourse.

(2) *Does any Matter placed in Q outside the Sermon belong to it?*—The same considerations support the exclusion from the historical Discourse of all those sayings which Q does not appear to have placed within it. To what has been said the two following may be added. First, that the occasions on which our Lord delivered teaching must have been very numerous. And, secondly, that many of His sayings appear to have been *obiter dicta*, not forming part of any set discourse, but arising out of some incident or circumstance of the Ministry.

The matter, however, which is included in the Sermon on Matthew's authority demands special consideration. We have to ask what value is to be set upon that authority. It might be supposed that, writing about the year 70, and perhaps in or near Palestine, he had access to valuable sources of information, and that this included a tradition as to the historical occasion of some of Q's scattered sayings. In that case, matter which we have excluded from Q's Sermon might have to be taken back, in an attempt to reconstruct the actual Discourse. But the examination of Matthew's methods which we made in Chapter II, and which led us to distrust him as a guide to the order and arrangement of Q, revealed procedures which must also destroy our confidence in him as a guide to the contents of the original Sermon. If his knowledge was such as to enable him to arrange Q's sayings in a more historically accurate distribution than in the original document itself, it may be doubted whether he would have been content to write a Gospel which is mainly a compilation out of two earlier documents. Moreover, in the case of his rearrangements of Mark, it would be very unreasonable to suppose these to be dictated by superior knowledge of



the historical order in which the events occurred. It is sufficiently clear that at least the main desire by which Matthew is actuated is that his matter should be topically arranged. And as we can trace rearrangement under the impulse of this purpose in the eighth and following chapters, it is reasonable to suppose rearrangement under the impulse of the same purpose in cc. 5-7. In saying this we do not imply that Matthew had no access to traditional sources of information. He may in many cases have had such—*e.g.* in that of some of his insertions into the substance of narratives drawn from Mark. But we are led to the conclusion that we cannot, solely on Matthew's authority, take back as part of the historical Sermon any saying which on Luke's authority stands outside it. To justify this step, strong independent evidence corroborating Matthew would be needed. And such there does not seem in any instance to be.

(3) *Does any other Synoptic Matter belong to the Sermon?*—With regard to the rest of the discourse matter found in our Gospels, it is easy to make plausible conjectures, but very difficult to find any definite evidence supporting the inclusion of any saying within the historical Discourse. The Synoptic matter outside Q divides into, first, the Marcan matter; and, secondly, the non-Q matter of Matthew and Luke. We will briefly consider each of these.

(a) The Marcan matter. The early date of Mark, coupled with the large use made of it by both Matthew and Luke, naturally leads us to give considerable weight to his placings of discourse. Further, if we regard Mark as having preserved, with at least moderate fidelity, the Petrine tradition, that is good reason for believing that he has correctly preserved the historical occasions of the sayings which he records. For hardly any one, it would seem, would be more likely to have known and remembered them than Peter, both from his intimate associations with the Master, and from his preaching and teaching activities from the Day of Pentecost onwards.

On the other hand, we have the facts that Mark omits all record of the Sermon, and that some of the sayings which he records are very loosely strung together—*e.g.* those in

4<sup>21-25</sup> and 9<sup>41-50</sup>. It rather looks as though Mark did not know on what occasions these sayings were spoken, but included them in his Gospel because (as Papias records the Elder to have stated) he was careful not to omit anything of what he had heard (Eus. 'Eccles. Hist.' bk. 3, c. 39).

But, when we come to examine these sayings individually, we find good reason to think that some of them were paralleled in Q, and some reason to suspect that Mark has drawn them from Q. And this leads us to think that Q may bear the same relationship to other Marcan sayings, where there is less evidence to support it. As Canon Streeter well says, 'The matter most characteristic of Mark consists in graphically told anecdote. On the other hand, the matter specially characteristic of Q consists in collections of short sayings, not unlike the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament, and in short parables. It is significant that whenever we find matter of this kind in Mark we usually find that much or all of it is paralleled in Q, and that the Q form seems more original.'<sup>a</sup>

(b) The non-Q (and non-Markan) matter of Matthew and Luke. As to this, there does not seem much that can profitably be said. For there is very little in the non-Markan matter of the Synoptists upon which we can pronounce with any sense of assurance that it is impossible for it to have been contained in Q. Thus we do not know of what this non-Q matter consists. But, whatever its extent may be, we may with some confidence say about it some things in general.

(i) If either Evangelist knew that any of this matter belonged historically to the Sermon, he would probably have located it so in his Gospel—Luke from motives of historical accuracy and Matthew from the desire to make the Sermon as comprehensive as possible. It is very possible, however, that neither was in a position to know.

(ii) It is not likely that the original Sermon included any parables, as distinct from parabolic sayings and similitudes such as are contained in our reconstructed Q. If we accept Mark's order, our Lord will have first adopted the parabolic method of teaching after the ascription by the Pharisees of

<sup>a</sup> In *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 167.

His miracles to a league with Beelzebub. And this was subsequent to the Call of the Twelve. Thus, if we may trust Mark's testimony, and Luke's location of the Sermon immediately after the Call of the Twelve, the Sermon was delivered before the adoption by our Lord of the method of speaking by parables. And, if we may follow Luke's order in 7<sup>1-8</sup><sup>3</sup>, the interval of time must have been somewhat considerable.

Account should also be taken of the reason which, according to Mark, our Lord gave to His disciples for speaking in parables (Mk. 4<sup>10-12</sup>). That purpose included the concealment of divine truth from 'those that are without,' and it is in speaking to the multitudes that He is said to have adopted the parabolic form. It is open to question whether our Lord's audience when He delivered the Sermon included representatives of that class from which it was His purpose to conceal divine truth. Such persons are doubtless in Christ's mind in the admonitions of Mt. 7<sup>6</sup>, but it seems easier to understand these words as spoken in reference to persons not present. But, even if some representatives of this class were present, it may be questioned whether they were present in sufficient numbers to make it appear probable that our Lord would have resorted to speaking in parables.

It seems then fairly safe to follow Mark, and to regard the method of speaking in parables as a later departure, marking a definite change from what had hitherto been our Lord's manner of teaching.

(iii) So far as we can judge from our reconstructed Q text, the historical Sermon is not likely to have contained matter of a definitely doctrinal or eschatological nature. For, as we shall show in some detail in Chapter XIII, these elements are but slight in our Q text. But it must not be forgotten that we have but fragments of the historical Discourse as our criterion.

Before we leave this subject, there is one thing more which it seems worth while to say. In discussing the questions which have hitherto occupied our attention in this chapter, the qualifying consideration should never be lost sight of, that many of our Lord's sayings were probably

repeated on different occasions. Thus we cannot argue that, because a saying was spoken in the Sermon, therefore it could not have been spoken on any subsequent occasion, or that, because a saying was spoken subsequently to the Sermon, on this account alone it could not have been included in the Sermon Discourse.

(4) *Does Q faithfully record the Type of Teaching?*—There remains the question of the type of teaching of the original Discourse. Is this faithfully represented by Q's report? Now the Sermon of Q is similar in its general character to the rest of Q's matter. It consists, like the rest, of short pithy sayings which are often of the nature of paradoxes and similitudes, and arranged in some kind of parallelism. Much of Q's Sermon is more or less closely paralleled elsewhere in the Synoptic tradition (on this see Chapter XII); and, even where it is not so paralleled, the general type and style of teaching is similar to that which we find elsewhere. Its purport is predominantly ethical.

At the farthest remove from this teaching stands that of the Fourth Gospel. This is true, not only of the great discourses of the later part of the Gospel, but also of the discourse matter which is assigned to the same period of the Ministry as that in which Luke places the Sermon. The teaching of the Fourth Gospel is emphatically christological. Our Lord explicitly asserts His Divinity. His tone is magisterial. The teaching is soteriological. Great stress is laid on faith in Christ, not only, as in the Synoptics, as the means of obtaining healing or of working wonders, but also as the means of obtaining personal salvation. And the teaching is profoundly mystical. It insists on a spiritual union between Christ and the believer whereby he is born again, and enters into life.

Can we so far trust John's record as to believe that the historical Sermon probably included at least some of those features of our Lord's teaching which are so prominent in his Gospel? A close consideration of the Johannine discourse matter seems to lead to the conclusion that we cannot do so. For the features in question are such as would naturally attain prominence through the spiritual experience, the moral insight, and the religious controversies, of the



early Church. They might therefore, with the lapse of time, be unconsciously inserted in the reports of our Lord's sayings. The sayings which the Fourth Gospel puts into the mouth of Christ are markedly similar to the Evangelist's own language. A comparison of the First Epistle of John with the Gospel discourses shows to how large an extent this is the case. And in several instances in the Gospel it is difficult to determine where the Evangelist's report of Christ's sayings ends and where his own comments begin (*e.g.* 3<sup>16-21, 31-36</sup> ; *cf.* 1<sup>16-18</sup> following words of the Baptist). Either then his own personality has become deeply saturated with the sayings of Christ, or the discourse matter which he records is deeply saturated with the author's personality. Probably there has been influence on both sides, but it is hard not to believe that the peculiar nature of the Johannine discourse matter is not very largely due to influence of the latter kind. The simplicity of the type of teaching preserved in Q's Sermon is in favour of its originality, and it is markedly similar to that contained in the Epistle of James, which may be the earliest Epistle of the N.T.

We should therefore hesitate to include in the historical Sermon any element which is not represented in Q's report.

## PART II.—EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY

## CHAPTER X

## PARALLELS AND AFFINITIES TO THE SERMON IN THE PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH LITERATURE

We now pass from the critical to the exegetical stage of our study. The ideas and the phraseology of the sayings of our Lord which we are going to consider are markedly Jewish in character, and cannot be rightly interpreted apart from the numerous parallels to them which are to be found in the Jewish literature. It will be convenient therefore to begin by exhibiting some of the most striking parallels to each of the sayings in our reconstructed Q text. We shall confine ourselves in this chapter to parallels of pre-Christian date. These can be supplemented in the course of our exegesis. We shall follow (normally) the order, text, and chapter and verse numeration of the R.V. for the books of the O.T., and for the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical books those of Dr. Charles' two-volume English translation (Clarendon Press, 1913).

Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

1 Sam. 2<sup>8</sup>: 'He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, He lifteth up the needy (LXX πτωχόν) from the dunghill.'

Ps. 35<sup>10</sup>: 'Which deliverest the poor (LXX πτωχόν) from him that is too strong for him, yea, the poor and the needy (LXX πτωχόν καὶ πένητα) from him that spoileth him.'

Ps. 72<sup>12-15</sup>: 'For he shall deliver the needy (LXX πτωχόν) when he crieth; And the poor, that hath no helper. He shall have pity on the poor (LXX πτωχοῦ) and needy, And the souls of the needy he shall save. He shall redeem

their soul from oppression and violence; And precious shall their blood be in his sight: And they shall live.'

Ps. 140<sup>12</sup>: 'I know that the Lord will maintain the cause of the afflicted (LXX τοῦ πτωχοῦ), And the right of the needy.'

Is. 66<sup>2</sup>: 'To this man will I look; even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word.'

Test. of Judah 25<sup>4</sup>: 'And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy, And they who were poor for the Lord's sake (οἱ πτωχοὶ διὰ Κύριον, α, β, S<sup>1</sup>) shall be made rich.'

Pss. of Solomon 10<sup>7</sup>: 'And the pious shall give thanks in the assembly of the people; And on the poor (πτωχούς) shall God have mercy in the gladness of Israel': cf. 5<sup>13-14</sup>.

Μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν.

Ps. 37<sup>11</sup> οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν.

1 Sam. 2<sup>4,9</sup>: 'The bows of the mighty men are broken, And they that stumbled are girded with strength. . . . For by strength shall no man prevail.'

Ps. 22<sup>26</sup>: 'The meek shall eat and be satisfied.'

Ps. 25<sup>9-13</sup>: 'The meek will he guide in judgement; And the meek will he teach his way. . . . And his seed shall inherit the land' (LXX κληρονομήσει γῆν).

Ps. 147<sup>6</sup>: 'The Lord upholdeth the meek: He bringeth the wicked down to the ground.'

Ps. 149<sup>4</sup>: 'For the Lord taketh pleasure in his people: He will beautify the meek with salvation.'

Prov. 3<sup>34</sup>: 'Surely he scorneth the scorners, But he giveth grace unto the lowly.'

Prov. 29<sup>23</sup>: 'A man's pride shall bring him low: But he that is of a lowly spirit shall obtain honour.'

Is. 57<sup>15</sup>: 'I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.'

Cf. Is. 66<sup>2</sup> quoted above.

Sirach 4<sup>25</sup>: 'Be humble towards God': 10<sup>28</sup>: 'My son, glorify thy soul in humility, And give it discretion such as befiteth it.'

Prayer of Azariah v. 16: 'But in a contrite heart and a humble spirit let us be accepted.'

Letter of Aristeeas, § 257: 'The king signified his

consent and asked another How he could meet with recognition when travelling abroad? "By being fair to all men," he replied, "and by appearing to be inferior rather than superior to those amongst whom he was travelling. For it is a recognised principle that God by His very nature accepts the humble. And the human race loves those who are willing to be in subjection to them." § 263: 'God brings the proud to nought, and exalts the meek and humble.'

Ethiopic Enoch 5<sup>7,8</sup>: 'But for the elect there shall be light and joy and peace, And they shall inherit the earth. And then there shall be bestowed upon the elect wisdom, And they shall all live and never again sin, Either through ungodliness or through pride: But they who are wise shall be humble.'

Slavonic Enoch 50<sup>2</sup> (A text): 'Now therefore, my children, in patience and meekness spend the number of your days, that you may inherit endless life.' 52<sup>13</sup> (A text): 'Blessed is he who speaks with humble tongue and heart to all.'

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>61</sup> (Arabic): 'Be humble in thy youth and thou shalt be honoured in thine old age.' Cf. 2<sup>35</sup> Armenian.

Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.

1 Sam. 2<sup>5</sup>: 'They that were full have hired out themselves for bread; And they that were hungry have ceased.'

Ps. 42<sup>1-2</sup>: 'As the hart panteth after the water brooks, So panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: When shall I come and appear before God?'

Ps. 63<sup>1</sup>: 'O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee, In a dry and weary land, where no water is,' and *passim*.

Ps. 107<sup>9</sup>: 'For he satisfieth the longing soul, And the hungry soul he filleth with good.'

Prov. 21<sup>21</sup>: 'He that followeth after righteousness and mercy Findeth life, righteousness, and honour.'

Is. 55<sup>1-3</sup>: 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without



price . . . Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live.'

Wisdom of Solomon, *passim*.

Slavonic Enoch 42<sup>11</sup> (B text): 'Blessed is he who sows the seeds of righteousness, for he shall reap sevenfold.'

Μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται.

Ps. 30<sup>11</sup>: 'Thou hast turned for me my mourning into dancing; Thou hast loosed my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness.'

Ps. 34<sup>18</sup>: 'The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, And saveth such as be of a contrite spirit.'

Ps. 51<sup>17</sup>: 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.'

Ps. 119<sup>135-136</sup>: 'Make thy face to shine upon thy servant; And teach me thy statutes. Mine eyes run down with rivers of water, Because they observe not thy law.'

Ps. 126<sup>5-6</sup>: 'They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. Though he goeth on his way weeping, bearing forth the seed; He shall come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him.'

Is. 57<sup>15</sup>, 66<sup>2</sup> quoted above. Prayer of Azariah v. 16 quoted above.

Tobit 13<sup>14</sup>: 'Blessed shall be all the men That shall sorrow for thee For all thy chastisements: Because they shall rejoice in thee And shall see all thy joy for ever.'

Sirach 4<sup>26</sup>: 'Be not ashamed to confess (thy) sins, And stand not against the stream.'

*Cf.* with the first four Beatitudes Is. 61<sup>1-3</sup>: 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek (LXX πτωχοῖς); he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort (LXX παρακαλέσαι) all that mourn (LXX τοὺς πενθοῦντας); to appoint unto them that mourn

in Zion, to give unto them a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.'

Μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.

2 Sam. 22<sup>26</sup> = Ps. 18<sup>25</sup>: 'With the merciful thou wilt shew thyself merciful, With the perfect man thou wilt shew thyself perfect.'

Ps. 41<sup>1</sup>: 'Blessed is he that considereth the poor: The Lord will deliver him in the day of evil.'

Micah 6<sup>8</sup>: 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'

Tobit 4<sup>7</sup>: 'Give alms of thy substance: turn not away thy face from any poor man, and the face of God shall not be turned away from thee'; cf. 14<sup>9</sup>.

Sirach 28<sup>1-5</sup>: 'He that taketh vengeance shall find vengeance from the Lord, And his sins (God) will surely keep (in memory). Forgive thy neighbour the injury (done to thee), And then, when thou prayest, thy sins will be forgiven. Man cherisheth anger against another; And doth he seek healing from God? On a man like himself he hath no mercy; And doth he make supplication for his own sins? He, being flesh, nourisheth wrath; Who will make atonement for his sins?'

Test. of Issachar 5<sup>2</sup>: 'Love the Lord and your neighbour, Have compassion on the poor and weak.'

Test. of Zebulun 5<sup>1-5</sup>: 'And now, my children, I bid you to keep the commands of the Lord, and to show mercy to your neighbours, and to have compassion towards all, not towards men only, but also towards beasts. For all this thing's sake the Lord blessed me, and when all my brethren were sick, I escaped without sickness, for the Lord knoweth the purposes of each. Have, therefore, compassion in your hearts, my children, because even as a man doeth to his neighbour, even so also will the Lord do to him. For the sons of my brethren were sickening and were dying on account of Joseph, because they showed not mercy in their hearts; but my sons were preserved without sickness, as ye know. And when I was in the land of Canaan, by the sea-coast, I made a catch of fish for Jacob my father;

and when many were choked in the sea, I continued unhurt.'

Test. of Benjamin 4<sup>1-4</sup>: 'See ye, therefore, my children, the end of the good man? Be followers of his compassion, therefore, with a good mind, that ye also may wear crowns of glory. For the good man hath not a dark eye; for he showeth mercy to all men, even though they be sinners. And though they devise with evil intent concerning him, by doing good he overcometh evil, being shielded by God; and he loveth the righteous as his own soul. If any one is glorified, he envieth him not; if any one is enriched, he is not jealous; if any one is valiant, he praiseth him; the virtuous man he laudeth; on the poor man he hath mercy; on the weak he hath compassion; unto God he singeth praises.'

Slavonic Enoch 42<sup>13</sup> (B text): 'Blessed is he in whose mouth is mercy and gentleness.'

Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ· ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.

Ps. 24<sup>34</sup>: 'Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? And who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart (LXX καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ); Who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, And hath not sworn deceitfully.'

Ps. 11<sup>7</sup>: 'For the Lord is righteous; he loveth righteousness: The upright shall behold his face.'

Wisdom 1<sup>1-2</sup>: 'Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth, Think ye of the Lord with a good mind, And in singleness of heart seek ye him; Because he is found of them that tempt him not, And is manifested to them that do not distrust him.'

Test. of Issachar 4<sup>1</sup>: 'And now, hearken to me, my children, And walk in singleness of your heart, For I have seen in it all that is well-pleasing to the Lord.' Cf. 7<sup>7</sup>.

Test. of Joseph 4<sup>6</sup>: 'And I said unto her: The Lord willeth not that those who reverence Him should be in uncleanness, nor doth He take pleasure in them that commit adultery, but in those that approach Him with a pure heart (ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ) and undefiled lips.'

Slavonic Enoch 45<sup>3</sup> (A text): 'When the Lord demands bread, or candles, or flesh (sc. cattle), or any other

sacrifice, then that is nothing; but God demands pure hearts, and with all that only tests the heart of man.'

Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί· ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

Ps. 34<sup>14-15</sup>: 'Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it. The eyes of the Lord are toward the righteous, And his ears are open unto their cry.'

Prov. 12<sup>20</sup>: 'To the counsellors of peace (LXX οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι εἰρήνην) is joy.'

Is. 52<sup>7</sup>: 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.'

Sirach 4<sup>10</sup>: 'Be as a father to orphans, And in place of a husband to widows; Then God will call thee "son" (LXX καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς υἱὸς Ὑψίστου), And will be gracious to thee, and deliver thee from the Pit.'

Slavonic Enoch 52<sup>11, 13</sup> (B text): 'Blessed is he who goes (*sc.* with others) and brings (*sc.* others) together in peace.' 'Blessed is he who speaks peace, and he has peace.'

Pss. of Solomon 12<sup>6</sup>: 'May the Lord preserve the quiet soul that hateth the unrighteous; And may the Lord establish the man that followeth peace at home.'

Pirké Aboth 1<sup>12</sup>: 'Hillel said: Be of the disciples of Aaron, one that loves peace, that pursues peace, that loves mankind and brings them nigh to Torah.'

Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν, καὶ εἴπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν, ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Χαίρετε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε· ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

Is. 51<sup>7, 12</sup>: 'Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye dismayed at their revilings.' 'I, even I, am he that comforteth you: who art thou, that thou art afraid of man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?'; and the prophetic descriptions of the suffering Servant of the Lord, esp. Is. 50<sup>4-9</sup>, 52<sup>13-53</sup><sup>12</sup>.

Slavonic Enoch c. 9 (A text): 'This place, O Enoch, is



prepared for the righteous, who endure all manner of offence from those that exasperate their souls, who avert their eyes from iniquity, and make righteous judgement, and give bread to the hungry, and cover the naked with clothing, and raise up the fallen, and help injured orphans, and who walk without fault before the face of the Lord, and serve Him alone, and for them is prepared this place for eternal inheritance.'

51<sup>3</sup> (A text): 'And every grievous and cruel yoke that comes upon you bear all for the sake of the Lord, and thus you will find your reward in the day of judgement.'

For the grouping together of Beatitudes, *cf.* Slavonic Enoch 42<sup>6-14</sup> (B text), and for the enumeration of moral qualities having resemblances to the Beatitudes of the Sermon, *cf.* Slavonic Enoch 66<sup>6</sup>: 'Walk, my children, in long-suffering, in meekness, honesty, in provocation, in grief, in faith and in truth, in reliance on promises, in illness, in abuse, in wounds, in temptation, in nakedness, in privation, loving one another, till you go out from this age of ills, that you become inheritors of endless time.'

Πλὴν οὐαὶ τοῖς πλουσίοις· ὅτι ἀπέχουσι τὴν παράκλησιν αὐτῶν.

Ps. 17<sup>13-14</sup>: 'Deliver my soul from the wicked by thy sword; From men, by thy hand, O Lord, From men of the world, whose portion is in this life, And whose belly thou fillest with thy treasure: They are satisfied with children, And leave the rest of their substance to their babes.'

Ps. 52<sup>5-7</sup>: 'God shall likewise destroy thee for ever, He shall take thee up, and pluck thee out of thy tent, And root thee out of the land of the living. The righteous also shall see it, and fear, And shall laugh at him, saying, Lo, this is the man that made not God his strength; But trusted in the abundance of his riches, And strengthened himself in his wickedness.'

Ethiopic Enoch 94<sup>8</sup>: 'Woe to you, ye rich, for ye have trusted in your riches, And from your riches shall ye depart, Because ye have not remembered the Most High in the days of your riches.'

Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἐμπεπλησμένοις· ὅτι πεινάσουσι καὶ διψήσουσι.

1 Sam. 2<sup>5</sup> quoted above. Aristeeas §263, quoted above.

Ethiopic Enoch 96<sup>5-6</sup>: 'Woe to you who devour the

finest of the wheat, And drink wine in large bowls, And tread underfoot the lowly with your might. Woe to you who drink water from every fountain, For suddenly shall ye be consumed and wither away, Because ye have forsaken the fountain of life.'

Οὐαὶ τοῖς γελοῖσι· ὅτι πενήθσουσι καὶ κλαύσουσι.

Ps. 35<sup>24-26</sup> : ' Judge me, O Lord my God, according to thy righteousness; And let them not rejoice over me. Let them not say in their heart, Aha, so would we have it: Let them not say, We have swallowed him up. Let them be ashamed and confounded together that rejoice at mine hurt: Let them be clothed with shame and dishonour that magnify themselves against me.'

Ethiopic Enoch 98<sup>13</sup> : ' Woe to you who rejoice in the tribulation of the righteous; for no grave shall be dug for you.'

Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι πάντες· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

Pss. 73 and 94.

Jerem. 5<sup>30-31</sup> : ' A wonderful and horrible thing is come to pass in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?'  
Cf. Is. 30<sup>10-11</sup>, Micah 2<sup>11</sup>.

For the grouping of of Woes *cf.* Sirach 2<sup>12-14</sup>.

For the grouping together of Beatitudes and Woes, *cf.* Deut. 27, 28, Slavonic Enoch 52<sup>1-15</sup>, and with the Beatitudes and Woes in general *cf.* Ps. 1.

Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἤλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἤλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

Jubilees 33<sup>18</sup> : ' For until that time there had not been revealed the ordinance and judgment and law in its completeness for all, but in thy days (it has been revealed) as a law of seasons and of days, and an everlasting law for the everlasting generations.'

Ethiopic Enoch 99<sup>2</sup> : ' Woe to them who pervert the words of uprightness, And transgress the eternal law';  
*cf.* 99<sup>14</sup>.

Test. of Levi 16<sup>3</sup> : ' [And a man who reneweth the law in the power of the Most High, ye shall call a deceiver; and

at last ye shall rush (upon him) to slay him, not knowing his dignity, taking innocent blood through wickedness upon your heads].’ \*

Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐ φονεύσεις, ὃς δ’ ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.

Gen. 9<sup>6</sup>: ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.’

Ex. 20<sup>13</sup> = Deut. 5<sup>17</sup>: ‘Thou shalt do no murder.’

Ex. 21<sup>12</sup>: ‘He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death’; cf. Lev. 24<sup>17</sup>.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει. ὃς δ’ ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, ‘Ρακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ. ὃς δ’ ἂν εἴπῃ, Μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν.

Lev. 19<sup>17</sup>: ‘Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart.’

Prov. 14<sup>17</sup>: ‘He that is soon angry will deal foolishly: And a man of wicked devices is hated.’ 16<sup>32</sup>: ‘He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; And he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city.’

Eccles. 7<sup>9</sup>: ‘Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry: for anger resteth in the bosom of fools.’

Sirach 1<sup>22</sup>: ‘Unrighteous wrath cannot be justified, For the wrath of his anger (will prove) his ruin.’ 27<sup>30</sup>: ‘Wrath and anger, these also are abominations, And a sinful man clingeth to them.’ 28<sup>6-7</sup>: ‘Remember thy last end, and cease from enmity; (Remember) corruption and death, and abide in the commandments. Remember the commandments, and be not wroth with thy neighbour; And (remember) the covenant of the Most High, and overlook ignorance’; cf. 10<sup>18</sup>.

Aristeas § 133: ‘Working out these truths carefully and having made them plain, he showed that even if a man should think of doing evil—to say nothing of actually effecting it—he would not escape detection, for he made it clear that the power of God pervaded the whole of the law.’

Test. of Dan 2<sup>1-5</sup>: ‘And now, my children, behold I am dying, and I tell you of a truth, that unless ye keep yourselves from the spirit of lying and of anger, and love

\* See Charles’ note *ad loc.* in *Apocr. and Pseudep. of the O.T.*, vol. ii. p. 313.

truth and long-suffering, ye shall perish. For anger is blindness and does not suffer one to see the face of any man with truth. For though it be a father or a mother, he behaveth towards them as enemies; though it be a brother, he knoweth him not; though it be a prophet of the Lord, he disobeyeth him; though a righteous man, he regardeth him not; though a friend, he doth not acknowledge him. For the spirit of anger encompasseth him with the net of deceit, and blindeth his eyes, and through lying darkeneth his mind, and giveth him its own peculiar vision. And wherewith encompasseth it his eyes? With hatred of heart, so as to be envious of his brother. For anger is an evil thing, my children, for it troubleth even the soul itself. And the body of the angry man it maketh its own, and over his soul it getteth the mastery, and it bestoweth upon the body power that it may work all iniquity. And when the body does all these things, the soul justifieth what is done, since it seeth not aright. Therefore he that is wrathful, if he be a mighty man, hath a threefold power in his anger: one by the help of his servants; and a second by his wealth, whereby he persuadeth and overcometh wrongfully; and thirdly, having his own natural power he worketh thereby the evil. And though the wrathful man be weak, yet hath he a power twofold of that which is by nature; for wrath ever aideth such in lawlessness. This spirit goeth always with lying at the right hand of Satan, that with cruelty and lying his works may be wrought. Understand ye therefore the power of wrath, that it is vain. For it first of all giveth provocation by word; then by deeds it strengtheneth him who is angry, and with sharp losses disturbeth his mind, and so stirreth up with great wrath his soul. Therefore, when any one speaketh against you, be not ye moved to anger. . . . For first it pleaseth the hearing, and so maketh the mind keen to perceive the grounds for provocation; and then being enraged, he thinketh that he is justly angry. If ye fall into any loss or ruin, my children, be not afflicted; for this very spirit maketh (a man) desire that which is perishable, in order that he may be enraged through the affliction. And if ye suffer loss voluntarily, or involuntarily, be not vexed; for from vexation ariseth wrath with



lying. Moreover, a twofold mischief is wrath with lying; and they assist one another in order to disturb the heart; and when the soul is continually disturbed, the Lord departeth from it, and Beliar ruleth over it. Observe, therefore, my children, the commandments of the Lord, And keep His law; Depart from wrath, And hate lying, That the Lord may dwell among you, And Beliar may flee from you. Speak truth each one with his neighbour. So shall ye not fall into wrath and confusion; But ye shall be in peace, having the God of peace, So shall no war prevail over you.' Cf. 6<sup>8</sup>.

Test. of Gad 3<sup>1-5</sup>: 'And now, my children, hearken to the words of truth to work righteousness, and all the law of the Most High, and go not astray through the spirit of hatred, for it is evil in all the doings of men. Whatsoever a man doeth the hater abominateth him: and though a man worketh the law of the Lord, he praiseth him not; though a man feareth the Lord, and taketh pleasure in that which is righteous, he loveth him not. He dispraiseth the truth, he envieth him that prospereth, he welcometh evil-speaking, he loveth arrogance, for hatred blindeth his soul; as I also then looked on Joseph. Beware, therefore, my children, of hatred; for it worketh lawlessness even against the Lord Himself. For it will not hear the words of His commandments concerning the loving of one's neighbour, and it sinneth against God. For if a brother stumble, it delighteth immediately to proclaim it to all men, and is urgent that he should be judged for it, and be punished and be put to death. And if it be a servant it stirreth him up against his master, and with every affliction it deviseth against him, if possibly he can be put to death. For hatred worketh with envy also against them that prosper: so long as it heareth of or seeth their success, it always languisheth. For as love would quicken even the dead, and would call back them that are condemned to die, so hatred would slay the living, and those that had sinned venially it would not suffer to live. For the spirit of hatred worketh together with Satan, through hastiness of spirit, in all things to men's death; but the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men. Hatred,

therefore, is evil, for it constantly mateth with lying, speaking against the truth; and it maketh small things to be great, and causeth the light to be darkness and calleth the sweet bitter, and teacheth slander, and kindleth wrath, and stirreth up war, and violence and all covetousness; it filleth the heart with evils and devilish poison. These things, therefore, I say to you from experience, my children, that ye may drive forth hatred, which is of the devil, and cleave to the love of God. Righteousness casteth out hatred, humility destroyeth envy. For he that is just and humble is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reprov'd not of another, but of his own heart, because the Lord looketh on his inclination. He speaketh not against a holy man, because the fear of God overcometh hatred. For fearing lest he should offend the Lord, he will not do wrong to any man, even in thought.' *Cf.* 6<sup>1</sup>.

Slavonic Enoch 44<sup>2-3</sup>: 'He who vents anger on any man without injury, the Lord's great anger will cut him down, he who spits on the face of man reproachfully, will be cut down at the Lord's great judgement.'

Pss. of Solomon 16<sup>10</sup>: 'Protect my tongue and my lips with words of truth; Anger and unreasoning wrath put far from me.'

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>52</sup> (Syr. A) (*cf.* 2<sup>53</sup> Arabic): 'My son, restrain a word in thy heart, and it shall be well with thee; because when thou hast exchanged thy word, thou hast lost thy friend.'

2<sup>53</sup> (Syr. A) (*cf.* 2<sup>45</sup> & 54<sup>a</sup> Arabic and v. 13 Ethiopic): 'My son, let not a word go forth from thy mouth, until thou hast taken counsel within thy heart: because it is better for a man to stumble in his heart than to stumble with his tongue.'

2<sup>8</sup> (Syr. B) (*cf.* 2<sup>55</sup> Syr. A, 2<sup>54</sup> Arabic, 2<sup>57</sup> Armenian, v. 3 Ethiopic): 'My son, stand not in the house of those that are at strife: because from a word there comes a quarrel, and from a quarrel is stirred up vexation: and from vexedness springs murder.'

Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.

Ex. 20<sup>14</sup> = Deut. 5<sup>18</sup>: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.'

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Ex. 20<sup>17</sup> = Deut. 5<sup>21</sup>: 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.'

Job 31<sup>1</sup>: 'I made a covenant with mine eyes; How then should I look upon a maid?'

Prov. 6<sup>25</sup>: 'Lust not after her (*i.e.* the evil woman's) beauty in thine heart; Neither let her take thee with her eyelids.'

Sirach 9<sup>5</sup>: 'On a maiden fix not thy gaze, Lest thou be entrapped in penalties with her.' 9<sup>8</sup>: 'Hide thine eye from a lovely woman, And gaze not upon beauty which is not thine; by the comeliness of a woman many have been ruined, And this way passion flameth like fire'; cf. 23<sup>4-5</sup>.

Aristeas § 133, quoted above, p. 150.

Test. of Reuben 3<sup>10-12</sup>: 'Pay no heed to the face of a woman, Nor associate with another man's wife, Nor meddle with affairs of womankind. For had I not seen Bilhah bathing in a covered place, I had not fallen into this great iniquity. For my mind taking in the thought of the woman's nakedness, suffered me not to sleep until I had wrought the abominable thing.' Cf. 5<sup>6</sup>.

Test. of Judah 17<sup>1</sup>: 'And now, I command you, my children, not to love money, nor to gaze upon the beauty of women; because for the sake of money and beauty I was led astray to Bathshua the Canaanite.'

Test. of Issachar 4<sup>4</sup>: 'And the spirits of deceit have no power against him, For he looketh not on the beauty of women, Lest he should pollute his mind with corruption.' 7<sup>2</sup>: 'I never committed fornication by the uplifting of my eyes.'

Test. of Benjamin 8<sup>2</sup>: 'He that hath a pure mind in love, looketh not after a woman with a view to fornication; for he hath no defilement in his heart, because the Spirit of God resteth upon him.'

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>19</sup> (Syr. A) (cf. 2<sup>7a, 20</sup> Syr. B): 'My son, go not after the beauty of a woman, and lust not after her in thy heart, because the beauty of a woman is her good sense, and her adornment is the word of her mouth.' 2<sup>72</sup> (Syr.): 'My son, let not thine eyes look upon a woman

that is beautiful; and be not inquisitive into beauty that does not belong to thee: because many have perished through the beauty of woman, and her love has been as a fire that burneth.'

Πάλιν ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐκ ἐπιорκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου.

Lev. 19<sup>12</sup>: 'And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, so that thou profane the name of thy God; I am the Lord.'

Numb. 30<sup>2</sup>: 'When a man voweth a vow unto the Lord, or sweareth an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.'

Deut. 23<sup>21, 23</sup>: 'When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not be slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. . . . That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do; according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, a freewill offering, which thou hast promised with thy mouth.'

Job 22<sup>27</sup>: 'Thou shalt pay thy vows.'

Ps. 50<sup>14</sup>: 'Pay thy vows unto the Most High.'

Ps. 76<sup>11</sup>: 'Vow, and pay unto the Lord your God.'

Eccles. 5<sup>4-5</sup>: 'When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou vowest. Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay.'

Sirach 18<sup>22</sup>: 'Delay not to pay thy vow in due time'; cf. 41<sup>19</sup>.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ θεοῦ· μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστι τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως· μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσης, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι. ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν, Ναὶ ναί, Οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

Sirach 23<sup>9-11</sup>: 'Accustom not thy mouth to an oath, Nor make a habit of the naming of the Holy One. For as a servant who is constantly being questioned Lacketh not the marks of a blow, So also he that sweareth and is continually naming the name of the Lord Is not free from sins. A man of many oaths is filled with iniquity, And the scourge



## 156 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

departeth not from his house; If he offend his sin will be upon him, And if he disregard it he sinneth doubly; And if he sweareth without need, he shall not be justified, For his house shall be filled with calamities.'

Slavonic Enoch 49<sup>1</sup> (A text): 'I swear to you, my children, but I swear not by any oath, neither by heaven nor by earth, not by any other creature which God created. The Lord said: "There is no oath in me, nor injustice, but truth." If there is no truth in men, let them swear by the words "yea, yea," or else "nay, nay."'

Philo 'On the Ten Commandments,' c. 17: 'That being which is the most beautiful, and the most beneficial to human life, and suitable to rational nature, swears not itself, because truth on every point is so innate within him that his bare words are accounted as oaths. Next to not swearing at all, the second best course is to keep one's oath; for by the mere fact of swearing the swearer raises the suspicion of his not being trustworthy.'

Ἦκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.

Lev. 24<sup>17-21</sup>: 'And he that smiteth any man mortally shall surely be put to death; and he that smiteth a beast mortally shall make it good: life for life. And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be rendered unto him. And he that killeth a beast shall make it good: and he that killeth a man shall be put to death.' Cf. Ex. 21<sup>23-25</sup>; Deut. 19<sup>21</sup>.

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· καὶ ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον ἓν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.

Ex. 23<sup>4, 5</sup>: 'If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.'

Lev. 19<sup>18</sup>: 'Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear

any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

Prov. 20<sup>22</sup> : ' Say not thou, I will recompense evil : Wait on the Lord, and he shall save thee.' 24<sup>29</sup> : ' Say not, I will do so to him as he hath done to me; I will render to the man according to his work.' 25<sup>21-22</sup> : ' If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; And if he be thirsty, give him water to drink: For thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, And the Lord shall reward thee.'

Is. 50<sup>6</sup> : ' I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.'

Lam. 3<sup>30</sup> : ' Let him give his cheek to him that smiteth him; let him be filled full with reproach.'

Sirach 10<sup>6</sup> : ' Requite not [evil to] thy neighbour for any wrong, And walk not in the way of pride.' 28<sup>1-5</sup> : ' He that taketh vengeance shall find vengeance from the Lord, And his sins (God) will surely keep (in memory). Forgive thy neighbour the injury (done to thee), And then, when thou prayest, thy sins will be forgiven. Man cherisheth anger against another; And doth he seek healing from God? On a man like himself he hath no mercy; And doth he make supplication for his own sins? He, being flesh, nourisheth wrath; Who will make atonement for his sins? '

Test. of Gad 6<sup>3-4, 7</sup> : ' Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from thee he take to swearing and so thou sin doubly. . . . And if he be shameless and persist in his wrong doing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging.'

Test. of Joseph 18<sup>2</sup> : ' And if any one seeketh to do evil unto you, do well unto him, and pray for him, and ye shall be redeemed of the Lord from all evil.'

Test. of Benjamin 5<sup>4</sup> : ' For if any one does violence to a holy man, he repenteth; for the holy man is merciful to his reviler, and holdeth his peace.'

Slavonic Enoch 50<sup>3-4</sup> : ' Endure for the sake of the Lord every wound, every injury, every evil word and attack.

## 158 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

If ill-requitals befall you, return them not either to neighbour or enemy, because the Lord will return them for you and be your avenger on the day of great judgement, that there be no avenging here among men.'

Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.

Deut. 15<sup>7-11</sup>.

Ps. 37<sup>21, 26</sup>: 'The righteous dealeth graciously, and giveth.' 'All the day long he dealeth graciously, and lendeth; And his seed is blessed.'

Prov. 22<sup>9</sup>: 'He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed; For he giveth of his bread to the poor.'

Tobit 4<sup>7</sup>: 'Give alms of thy substance: turn not away thy face from any poor man, and the face of God shall not be turned away from thee'; cf. 4<sup>8, 11, 16</sup>, 12<sup>8, 9</sup>, 14<sup>10, 11</sup>, and the stress laid on Tobit's almsgiving 1<sup>3, 16-17</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 14<sup>2</sup>.

Sirach 4<sup>4-5</sup>: 'Despise not the supplication of the poor, And turn not away from the afflicted soul. From him that asketh turn not thine eye away, And give him none occasion to curse thee'; cf. 29<sup>1-2</sup>.

Test. of Issachar 7<sup>5</sup>: 'If any man were in distress I joined my sighs with his, And I shared my bread with the poor. I wrought godliness, all my days I kept truth.'

Test. of Zebulun 7<sup>2-3</sup>: 'Do you, therefore, my children, from that which God bestoweth upon you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all men, and give to every man with a good heart. And if ye have not the wherewithal to give to him that needeth, have compassion for him in bowels of mercy.'

Slavonic Enoch 9<sup>1</sup>: 'This place, O Enoch, is prepared for the righteous, who endure all manner of offence from those that exasperate their souls, who avert their eyes from iniquity, and make righteous judgement, and give bread to the hungering, and cover the naked with clothing, and raise up the fallen, and help injured orphans, and who walk without fault before the face of the Lord, and serve Him alone, and for them is prepared this place for eternal inheritance.' 44<sup>4-5</sup>: 'Blessed is the man who does not direct his heart with malice against any man, and helps the injured and condemned, and raises the broken down, and

shall do charity to the needy, because on the day of the great judgement every weight, every measure and every make-weight will be as in the market, that is to say they are hung on scales and stand in the market, and every one shall learn his own measure, and according to his measure shall take his reward.' 51<sup>1-2</sup>: 'Stretch out your hands to the poor according to your strength. Hide not your silver in the earth. Help the faithful man in affliction, and affliction will not find you in the time of your trouble.'

Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.

Lev. 19<sup>18</sup>: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

Tobit 4<sup>15</sup>: 'And what thou thyself hatest, do to no man.'

Aristeas § 207: 'The king received the answer with great delight and looking at another said, "What is the teaching of wisdom?" And the other replied, "As you wish that no evil should befall you, but to be a partaker of all good things, so you should act on the same principle towards your subjects and offenders, and you should mildly admonish the noble and good. For God draws all men to Himself by His benignity."'

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>88</sup> (Armenian): 'Son, that which seems evil unto thee do not to thy companion; and what is not thine own, give not unto others.'

Talmud 'Bab. Schab.' fol. 31. 1 (quoted from Light-foot, 'Horae Heb.' vol. ii. p. 158): 'A certain Gentile came to Shammai, and said, "Make me a proselyte, that I may learn the whole law, standing upon one foot": Shammai beat him with the staff that was in his hand. He went to Hillel, and he made him a proselyte, and said, "That which is odious to thyself, do it not to thy neighbour": for this is the whole law.'

Philo, quoted in Eus. 'Prep. of the Gospel,' Bk. 8, c. 7: 'Moreover, it is ordained in the laws themselves that no one shall do to his neighbour what he would be unwilling to have done to himself' (ἅ τις παθεῖν ἐχθαίρει, μὴ ποιεῖν αὐτόν).

Ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου.

Lev. 19<sup>18</sup>: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'



Deut. 23<sup>3-4, 6</sup>: 'An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of the Lord for ever: because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor from Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever.' 25<sup>17-19</sup>: 'Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way as ye came forth out of Egypt; how he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary; and he feared not God. Therefore it shall be, when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget.'

2 Chron. 19<sup>2</sup>: 'And Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to meet him, and said to king Jehoshaphat, Shouldest thou help the wicked, and love them that hate the Lord? for this thing wrath is upon thee from before the Lord.'

Ps. 26<sup>5</sup>: 'I hate the congregation of evildoers, And will not sit with the wicked.' Ps. 139<sup>21-22</sup>: 'Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies.'

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς· ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι; καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; γίνεσθε ὑμεῖς οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος οἰκτίρμων ἐστὶ.

Ps. 35<sup>11-14</sup>: 'Unrighteous witnesses rise up; They ask me of things that I know not. They reward me evil for good, To the bereaving of my soul. But as for me, when they were sick, my clothing was sackcloth: I afflicted my

soul with fasting; And my prayer returned into mine own bosom. I behaved myself as though it had been my friend or my brother: I bowed down mourning, as one that bewaileth his mother.'

Lev. 11<sup>44</sup>: 'Be ye holy; for I am holy'; *cf.* 11<sup>45</sup>, 19<sup>2</sup>, 20<sup>7, 26</sup>.

Aristeas § 227: 'The king expressed his approval and asked the next, To whom ought a man to show liberality? And he replied, "All men acknowledge that we ought to show liberality to those who are well disposed towards us, but I think that we ought to show the same keen spirit of generosity to those who are opposed to us that by this means we may win them over to the right and to what is advantageous to ourselves. But we must pray to God that this may be accomplished, for He rules the minds of all men."'

Test. of Simeon 3<sup>5-6</sup>: 'For if a man flee to the Lord, the evil spirit runneth away from him, and his mind is lightened. And henceforward he sympathiseth with him whom he envied and forgiveth those who are hostile to him, and so ceaseth from his envy.'

Test. of Zebulun 8<sup>4-6</sup>: 'And when we went down into Egypt, Joseph bore no malice against us. To whom taking heed, do ye also, my children, approve yourselves without malice, and love one another; and do not set down in account, each one of you, evil against his brother. For this breaketh unity and divideth all kindred, and troubleth the soul, and weareth away the countenance.'

Test. of Gad 6<sup>3-4, 7</sup>, quoted above.

Test. of Joseph 18<sup>1-2</sup>: 'If ye also, therefore, walk in the commandments of the Lord, my children, He will exalt you there, and will bless you with good things for ever and ever. And if any one seeketh to do evil unto you, do well unto him, and pray for him, and ye shall be redeemed of the Lord from all evil.'

Pirké Aboth 3<sup>2</sup>: 'R. Hanina, the deputy of the priests, said: "Pray for the peace of the kingdom; for except for the fear of that we should have swallowed up each his neighbour alive."'<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> As his title shows, R. Hanina had served in the Temple; but his date cannot be further defined. It is thus doubtful if this saying is of pre-Christian date.

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>20</sup> (Syr. A): 'My son, if thine enemy meet thee with evil, meet thou him with wisdom' (Syr. B: 'good'); cf. Arabic 2<sup>19b, 58b</sup>: 'If thine enemy wrong thee, show him kindness.' 'Him who mocks thee do thou respect and honour and be beforehand with him in greeting.'

Sirach 18<sup>13</sup>: 'The mercy of man is (exercised upon) his own kin, But the mercy of God is (extended) to all flesh, Reproving, and chastening, and teaching, And bringing them back as a shepherd his flock.'

Aristeas §§ 187-188: 'Taking an opportunity afforded by a pause in the banquet the king asked the envoy who sat in the seat of honour (for they were arranged according to seniority), How he could keep his kingdom unimpaired to the end? After pondering for a moment he replied, "You could best establish its security if you were to imitate the unceasing benignity of God. For if you exhibit clemency and inflict mild punishments upon those who deserve them in accordance with their deserts, you will turn them from evil and lead them to repentance." ' § 208: 'If you understood everything you would be filled with pity, for God also is pitiful.'

Test. of Zebulun 9<sup>7</sup> (α text): 'And after these things ye shall remember the Lord and repent, And He shall have mercy upon you, for He is merciful and compassionate. And He setteth not down in account evil against the sons of men, Because they are flesh, and are deceived through their own wicked deeds.'

καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυνόμενον, δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Sirach 28<sup>1-5</sup> quoted above, p. 145. Test. of Zebulun 5<sup>1-5</sup> quoted above, p. 145.

Slavonic Enoch 44<sup>4-5</sup> quoted above, pp. 158, 159; 63<sup>1</sup>: 'When man clothes the naked and fills the hungry, he will find reward from God.'

Pirké Aboth 1<sup>6</sup>: 'Judge every man with a leaning to his merit' (Joshua b. Perahiah c. 110 B.C.). 2<sup>5</sup>: 'Judge not thine associate until thou comest to his place' (Hillel).

Story of Ahikar 8<sup>41</sup> (Syr.) (*cf.* 8<sup>36, 38</sup> Arabic, 8<sup>27</sup> Armenian): 'And to him that doeth good, what is good shall be recompensed: and to him that doeth evil, what is evil shall be rewarded. And he that diggeth a pit for his neighbour, filleth it with his own stature.'

Philo, *Fragm.* preserved by Antonius, Ser. 57: 'Behave to your servants in the same manner in which you desire that God should behave to you; for as we hear them we shall be heard by Him, and as we regard them we shall be regarded by Him. (Ὡς γὰρ ἀκούομεν ἀκουσθησόμεθα, καὶ ὡς ὀρώμεν ὀρασθησόμεθα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.) Let us therefore let our compassion outrun compassion, that we may receive a like requital from Him for our mercy to them.'

Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;

Test. of Levi 14<sup>4</sup>: 'But if ye be darkened through transgressions, what, therefore, will all the Gentiles do living in blindness? Yea, ye shall bring a curse upon our race, because the light of the law which was given for to lighten every man this ye desire to destroy by teaching commandments contrary to the ordinances of God.'

Story of Ahikar 2<sup>48</sup> (Syr. A) (*cf.* 2<sup>44</sup> Arabic, 2<sup>51</sup> Armenian): 'My son, better is he that is blind of eye than he that is blind of heart; for the blind of eye straightway learneth the road and walketh in it: but the blind of heart leaveth the right way and goeth into the desert.'

Philo, 'On Courage,' § 2: 'But if any persons, utterly disregarding the true wealth of nature, pursue instead the riches of vain opinions, relying on what is blind instead of on what is gifted with sight, and taking a guide for their road who is himself crippled, such men must of necessity fall down.' (τυφλῷ πρὸ βλέποντος σκηριπτόμενοι, καὶ ἡγεμόνι τῆς ὁδοῦ χρώμενοι πεπηρωμένῳ, πίπτειν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὀφείλουσιν.)

Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐδὲ δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ· ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ.

Sirach 10<sup>1-3</sup>: 'A wise governor instructeth his people; And the rule of one that is discerning is well-ordered. As is the governor of a people, so are his officers; And as is the head of a city, so are its inhabitants. A reckless king



ruineth his people, But a city becometh populous through the prudence of its princes.'

Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ὑπερβαλεῖς τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; ὑποκριτά, ἐκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

Pss. of Solomon 4<sup>1-3</sup>: 'Wherefore sittest thou, O profane (man), in the council of the pious, Seeing that thy heart is far removed from the Lord, Provoking with transgressions the God of Israel? Extravagant in speech, extravagant in outward seeming beyond all (men), Is he that is severe of speech in condemning sinners in judgement. And his hand is first upon him as (though he acted) in zeal, And (yet) he is himself guilty in respect of manifold sins and of wantonness.'

Talmud Bab. Erachin, fol. 16. 2 (quoted from Lightfoot, 'Horae Hebr.' vol. ii. p. 158): 'R. Tarphon said, "I wonder whether there be any in this age that will receive reproof: but if one saith to another, Cast out the mote out of thine eye, he will be ready to answer, Cast out the beam out of thine own eye."'<sup>a</sup>

Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.

Prov. 9<sup>7-8</sup>: 'He that correcteth a scorner getteth to himself shame: And he that reproveth a wicked man getteth himself a blot. Reprove not a scorner, lest he hate thee: Reprove a wise man and he will love thee.' 23<sup>9</sup>: 'Speak not in the hearing of a fool; For he will despise the wisdom of thy words.'

Sirach 22<sup>7-8</sup>: 'He who teacheth a fool is (as) one that glueth together a potsherd, (Or) as one that awakeneth a sleeper out of a deep sleep. He that discourseth to a fool is as one discoursing to him that slumbereth, And at the end

<sup>a</sup> R. Tarphon had been a priest in the Temple. He was a strong opponent of the Jewish Christians, and was probably put to death in A.D. 117. This saying is thus of slightly post-Christian date. But it may well be independent of Christ's words; cf. I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 101.

he saith "What is it?" 22<sup>18</sup>: 'Talk not much with a foolish man, And consort not with a pig: Beware of him, lest thou have trouble, And thou becomest defiled when he shaketh himself. Turn from him, and thou wilt find rest, And (so) shalt thou not be wearied with his folly.'

Οὐ δύναται δένδρον καλὸν καρπὸν σαπρὸν ποιεῖν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν καρπὸν καλὸν ποιεῖν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται. μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἐξ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὴν, ἢ ἐκ τριβόλων σῦκα;

Sirach 27<sup>6</sup>: 'Upon the cultivation of the tree dependeth the fruit; So (dependeth) man's thought upon his nature.'

Slavonic Enoch 42<sup>14</sup> (A text): 'And I saw all the Lord's works, how they are right, while the works of man are some good, and others bad, and in their works are known those who lie evilly.'

Ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐκβάλλει τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει τὸ πονηρόν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

Ezek. 11<sup>19-20</sup>: 'And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God.' 36<sup>26-27</sup>: 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgements, and do them.'

Sirach 37<sup>16-18</sup>: 'The beginning of every action is speech, And before every work is the thought. The roots of the heart's deliberations Bring forth four branches: Good and evil, life and death; But the tongue ruleth over them altogether.'

Test. of Simeon 5<sup>1-2</sup>: 'Therefore was Joseph comely in appearance, and goodly to look upon, because no wickedness dwelt in him; for some of the trouble of the spirit the face manifesteth. And now, my children, Make

your hearts good before the Lord, And your ways straight before men, And ye shall find grace before the Lord and men.'

Test. of Naphtali 2<sup>6</sup> (β text): 'As a man's strength, so also is his work; and as his mind, so also is his skill; and as his purpose, so also is his achievement; and as his heart, so also is his mouth; as his eye, so also is his sleep; as his soul, so also is his word, either in the law of the Lord, or in the works of Beliar.' 2<sup>10</sup>: 'For if thou bid the eye to hear, it cannot; so neither while ye are in darkness can ye do the works of light.'

Test. of Asher 1<sup>3-9</sup>: 'Two ways hath God given to the sons of men, and two inclinations, and two kinds of action, and two modes (of action) and two issues. Therefore all things are by twos, one over against the other. For there are two ways of good and evil, and with these are the two inclinations in our breasts discriminating them. Therefore if the soul take pleasure in the good (inclination), all its actions are in righteousness; and if it sin it straightway repenteth. For, having its thoughts set upon righteousness, and casting away wickedness, it straightway overthroweth the evil, and uprooteth the sin. But if it incline to the evil inclination, all its actions are in wickedness, and it driveth away the good, and cleaveth to the evil, and is ruled by Beliar; even though it work what is good, he perverteth it to evil. For whenever it beginneth to do good, he forceth the issue of the action into evil for him, seeing that the treasure of the inclination is filled with an evil spirit.'

Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, Κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ὃ λέγω;

Ezek. 33<sup>30-32</sup>: 'And as for thee, son of man, the children of thy people talk of thee by the walls and in the doors of the houses, and speak one to another, every one to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words but do them not: for with their mouth they shew much love, but their heart goeth after their gain. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play

well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.'

Πᾶς ὅστις ἔρχεται πρὸς με καὶ ἀκούει μου τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἐστὶν ὁμοίος· ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ὅστις ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε καὶ ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσε· τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων τούτων, καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ὅστις ὠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον· καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔπεσε· καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

Prov. 10<sup>25</sup>: 'When the whirlwind passeth, the wicked is no more: But the righteous is an everlasting foundation'; *cf.* 1<sup>24-33</sup>, 12<sup>7</sup>, 14<sup>11</sup>.

Jerem. 17<sup>5-8</sup>: 'Thus saith the Lord: Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, a salt land and not inhabited. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out his roots by the river, and shall not fear when heat cometh, but his leaf shall be green; and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit'; *cf.* Ezek. 13<sup>10-14</sup>.

Tobit 4<sup>8-10</sup>: 'As thy substance is, give alms of it according to thine abundance: if thou have much, according to the abundance thereof, give alms; if thou have little, bestow it, and be not afraid to give alms according to that little: for thou layest up a good treasure for thyself against the day of necessity: because alms delivereth from death, and suffereth not to come into darkness.' 12<sup>8-10</sup>: 'Do the good, and evil shall not find you. Better is prayer with truth, and alms with righteousness, than riches with unrighteousness; it is better to give alms than to lay up gold: almsgiving doth deliver from death, and it purges away all sin. They that do alms shall be fed with life; they that



commit sin and unrighteousness are enemies to their own life.'

*Cf.* with the stress in the Sermon on the heart Test. of Zebulun 1<sup>4</sup>: 'I am not conscious that I have sinned all my days, save in thought'; Story of Ahikar 2<sup>29</sup> (Armenian): 'Son, crush and consume the evil out of thy heart, and it is well for thee with God and man, and thou art holpen by the will of God.'

## CHAPTER XI

## THE PRIMARY MEANING OF THE SERMON

We now proceed to examine the meaning and associations which the words in our reconstructed text of the Sermon would have for Jewish minds in the first century, with a view to reaching an interpretation of them free from the subjective element and historically accurate. The primary meaning is far from being the sole import of such pregnant sayings; but the true primary meaning is the only foundation upon which further implications and applications can rightly be reared. Let us then try to understand the Sermon as those who first heard it understood it, not however losing sight of the possibility that our Lord, while conveying His thoughts through the medium of common Jewish expressions, may not have meant by them precisely what they imported in the current Jewish usage.

The analysis of the Discourse is simple: (1) It began with the enunciation of elements of blessedness, enforced by warnings in the shape of Woes pronounced on the opposites of these qualities. (2) Then came illustrations of the revision of the Jewish moral standards. (3) This was succeeded by warnings against the criticising of others. (4) Then we have a prohibition of giving that which is holy to the dogs, and the sayings about the good and the bad tree and the good and the bad heart; and finally (5) the duty of doing as well as hearing, enforced by the illustration of the wise and the foolish builders. We will take each of these sections in order.

I. THE BEATITUDES AND WOES.<sup>a</sup>—The first Beatitude

<sup>a</sup> As the word 'Blessed' occurs nine times, we reckon the Beatitudes as nine in number. At the same time we are not unmindful that the great similarity between the last two constitutes considerable justification for the scholastic enumeration of eight Beatitudes.

is pronounced upon the 'poor.' What does our Lord mean by the word? In the LXX  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$  is so frequently the rendering of the Hebrew  $\text{אָנִי}$  (38 times) that it seems most probable that it is of the corresponding Aramaic word that  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$  is here the translation. Now there are passages in the Mosaic Code where  $\text{אָנִי}$  simply denotes economic poverty (e.g. Ex. 22<sup>25</sup>). But in the prophets and the poetical books (especially the Psalms) it is frequently used in a specialised sense, of those humbled or bowed down, as by oppression or misfortune. In the later Jewish literature the word has acquired a religious colouring also, and has come to mean 'those who in their oppression have drawn nearer to God and leave their cause in His hands. They are the pious Israelites who suffer from the tyranny of the heathen or of their worldly countrymen, and who refuse to assert themselves, but accept in a humble spirit the chastening sent by God.'<sup>a</sup> In many passages they are assured of deliverance and blessing. It seems both natural and probable to interpret the Beatitude of Christ in accordance with the meaning which  $\text{אָנִי}$  had come to acquire. St. Matthew certainly interpreted it in this way, as is shown by his addition of  $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ . And we may fairly conclude that this was the interpretation of the Beatitude commonly held by the Palestinian Christians of the second generation. We are inclined also to believe that the word  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$  has the same meaning in our Lord's words recorded in Lk. 4<sup>18</sup>, and in Lk. 7<sup>22</sup> = Mt. 11<sup>5</sup>.

That this is right is confirmed by a consideration of the next Beatitude, pronounced upon the 'meek.' This Beatitude appears to be based on Ps. 37<sup>11</sup>, and there and in seven other places  $\pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\acute{\varsigma}$  is the LXX rendering of the Hebrew  $\text{אָנִי}$ . Now  $\text{אָנִי}$  was, like its kindred word  $\text{אָנִי}$ , a distinctive designation of the oppressed righteous, the difference between the two terms being, according to Driver, that while the former means properly, as we have already noticed, one who is humbled by adverse external circumstances, the latter denotes one who voluntarily humbles himself under the divine will.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 22.

<sup>b</sup> See Art. 'Poor,' Hastings' *D.B.* vol. iv.

To our Lord's hearers, then, the import of these two words would be a very full and comprehensive one, embracing the whole of a familiar type of character. Of what its features were we can learn something further from the other terms used to denote it in the Jewish literature, and from the contexts in which they occur. The 'poor' and the 'meek' are also designated by other more or less synonymous words and phrases—*e.g.* those that fear, love, seek, wait for, Yahweh, His servants, the godly, the righteous. They are constantly spoken of as being hated and evil entreated by their enemies and persecutors, who are represented as having characteristics opposite to theirs; *e.g.* they are wicked, evildoers, proud, etc., and they set themselves in various ways to dishonour God and to bring reproach upon His servants. In many passages their oppression is implied to be inflicted upon them because of their godliness which the wicked hate. Their attitude under trial is represented as one of non-resistance to their oppressors. They commit their cause into God's hands and entreat Him to defend them.<sup>a</sup> We can also supplement our picture from the N.T. descriptions of individuals who answer to this type, such as that which St. Luke gives in his Gospel of the Infancy. It is upon this type of character then that our Lord pronounces blessing. It appears in fact to have been the most open to accept His Person and His teaching. But perhaps He was especially thinking, as in the ninth Beatitude, of this type as it would be manifested in the future under the stress of persecution for His sake.

Looking back now to the text of the Sermon, it is clear that of neither of the first two Beatitudes is the meaning accurately conveyed by the Greek rendering. No doubt the suffering righteous often were literally poor, but literal poverty is only a subordinate element in the import of the word עֲנִי. πρᾶτος also is somewhat misleading. Like our English 'meek,' it is predicated mainly of a person's attitude towards his fellows, whereas עָנָו denotes rather humility towards God.

The third and fourth Beatitudes in our reconstructed

<sup>a</sup> Cf. *e.g.*, besides the passages quoted in the last chapter, Pss. 9<sup>18</sup>, 14<sup>6</sup>, 34<sup>6</sup>  
40<sup>17</sup>.



text form a pair, as do the first and second. Of the meaning of the third there seems little room for doubt. The terms 'hunger' and 'thirst' are, by a natural metaphor, employed in secular as well as sacred literature to express the deeper cravings of man. And in both the O.T. and the N.T. they are used to denote a spiritual yearning towards God Himself. The precise meaning of our fourth Beatitude is not so easy to determine. The question we have to consider is, To what kind of mourning and weeping do the words refer? *πενθεῖν* in the LXX is nearly always a translation of the Hebrew *אָבַל* (41 times). But this word is used in a variety of senses, sometimes of mourning for the dead, sometimes of mourning for calamity, and sometimes of mourning for sin. The following considerations may help to determine the meaning here.

(1) It seems probable that in all the Beatitudes our Lord has in mind the 'poor' of the first Beatitude, and their characteristics. Now in previous ages they had often had much cause to mourn on account of the personal calamities which they endured at the hands of their enemies and oppressors, and also on account of national calamities, especially those due to foreign foes. And in our Lord's days they doubtless mourned that their nation was in subjection to the Romans. But their mourning seems then to have been predominantly for their personal sins, and for those of their nation, which were retarding the 'consolation of Israel' and the 'redemption of Jerusalem,' to which they looked forward.<sup>a</sup>

(2) In these opening Beatitudes the first verses of Is. 61 seem to have been specially present to our Lord's mind. St. Luke tells us that He took the text of His sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth from the opening words of this chapter, and applied to Himself and to His message the description which the prophet there gives of his office and mission.<sup>b</sup> And in the message which our Lord sent to the Baptist in prison there seems to be the trace of this same passage.<sup>c</sup> It is interesting to notice that *עֲנִים* occurs in the first verse of Is. 61, *אָבַלִים* in v. 2, and that much of the import of the word *עֲנִים* of the first

<sup>a</sup> Lk. 2 25, 38.

<sup>b</sup> Lk. 4 16-30.

<sup>c</sup> Mt. 11 5 = Lk. 7 22.

Beatitude is contained in the other descriptive words of *v.* 1. Now what kind of mourning is it of which the prophet here speaks? It seems to be primarily, as in *Is.* 60<sup>20</sup>, mourning for national and personal calamities. But to the Jewish mind calamity and sin were inseparable in thought, as were prosperity and righteousness. The immediate context of this passage affords an instance of this fact. In *vv.* 20 and 21 of *c.* 60, directly after the promise 'the days of thy mourning shall be ended' come the words 'Thy people also shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land for ever.' It is thus quite possible that when our Lord quoted this passage in reference to Himself and His message it was in the deeper sense of sorrow at all thwarting of God's purposes through sin that He took the prophet's words.

(3) In many passages of the Psalms and elsewhere, as we saw in the last chapter, blessing is assured to mourning of this kind. There was abundant precedent for the promise of comfort to those who are of 'a broken and contrite heart' (*Ps.* 51<sup>17</sup>).

(4) That this is the sense in which the words of the Beatitude are to be understood seems the more probable when we place it in connexion with the third. So interpreted, there is a close parallelism between the two. The latter pronounces blessing on those who turn away from sin and mourn over it; the former on those who turn towards God and aspire after Him. In the terminology of mystical theology the one represents the detachment, the other the attachment, of the soul. In each case the reference is probably both individual and national. The two spheres are closely connected in the religious consciousness.

It is important to notice that there is nothing to lead us to suppose that mourning on account of bereavement was specially in our Lord's mind. The English 'mourn' is apt to suggest this more than the Greek. For out of the nine other occurrences in the N.T. of the word *πενθεῖν* there is but one where it denotes mourning for bereavement, viz. *Mk.* 16<sup>10</sup> (of the death of Christ), whilst in at least four cases the mourning is for sin (viz. *Mt.* 9<sup>15</sup>, *1 Cor.* 5<sup>2</sup>, *2 Cor.* 12<sup>21</sup> and *Jas.* 4<sup>9</sup>).

Of the remaining Beatitudes, the import and reference seem to be less doubtful and ambiguous, *i.e.* if we may trust the Greek version of them as being faithful to the meaning of the original. In the case of the first we have seen reason to think that its import and associations are substantially different from those of the Greek rendering ; —at least, from what the Greek would convey to Gentile readers unacquainted with the LXX. There does not appear to be reason to suspect such a difference in the case of the Beatitudes which remain for consideration. We therefore take the pronouncements, ‘Blessed are the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, and the persecuted,’ to have been intended to convey substantially what these words are naturally taken to mean. ἐλεῆμων denotes the feeling of compassion which is excited by another’s misery. It would therefore be more accurately rendered ‘compassionate,’ or ‘pitiful,’ than ‘merciful’: for we use the term ‘merciful’ also to denote a forgiving disposition in regard to men’s offences against us.

The word εἰρηνοποιοί is rather a rare one, and is used in classical Greek in the sense of national peace commissioners. But in the one passage in the LXX where the verb occurs (Prov. 10<sup>10</sup>) it bears a general sense, and so also in the one other passage in the N.T. where it is found (Col. 1<sup>20</sup>). It is obvious that in the Beatitude its sense is quite general. The national sphere of the duty of peaceableness is doubtless included within its scope, and in view of the state of popular feeling in our Lord’s time may have suggested itself rather prominently to His hearers. But its full reference is clearly to an active peaceableness in all the relations of life. The persecution of the eighth Beatitude doubtless refers to suffering endured in behalf of the right (as Matthew has it, ‘for righteousness’ sake). Perhaps our Lord was thinking of the persecution which His disciples would undergo on account of their allegiance to Him. This is explicitly stated in the expanded form of this saying contained in the last Beatitude. There the persecution is said to be ‘for the Son of man’s sake.’ Thus the eighth and ninth Beatitudes recapitulate the thought of the first. The series both opens and closes with the thought of the oppressed righteous.

Before passing to the Woes it is worth while to inquire into the probable source of the sixth Beatitude. The two nearest parallels in the Psalms are Ps. 117 and Ps. 24<sup>3, 4</sup>. The latter passage especially seems to have been present to our Lord's mind. This is the only place in the LXX where the expression καθαρός τῇ καρδίᾳ occurs,<sup>a</sup> and one of the two passages in the O.T. in which alone the corresponding Hebrew phrase בַּר יֵלֶכֶת is found, and in it purity of heart is linked with the thought of seeing God. It is therefore probable that we have in this Beatitude an adapted quotation from Ps. 24 and that our Lord used words corresponding to the בַּר יֵלֶכֶת of its fourth verse. Now of the Hebrew words denoting purity the adjective בַּר is the least tinged with the idea of ceremonial cleanness. In six out of its seven occurrences in the O.T. it is used in an ethical sense (Job 11<sup>4</sup>, Ps. 19<sup>9</sup>, 24<sup>4</sup>, 73<sup>1</sup>, Cantt. 6<sup>9, 10</sup>), and, as already noticed, in two out of these six בַּר יֵלֶכֶת is added (Pss. 24<sup>4</sup>, 73<sup>1</sup>). Its root meaning seems to be 'separate,' and in conjunction with the defining word it will have signified to the hearers a separation from sin which is inward, of thought, feeling and purpose (*cf.* the Psalmist's immediately following words, 'who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity').

St. Luke's account of the Woes suggests that each of them was the counterpart of one of the Beatitudes. If so, the first will have designated the prosperous ungodly, the second the self-satisfied, the third the impenitent, and the fourth those who are well spoken of because they are worldly. It cannot be said that there is much, either in the connotation in LXX usage of the Greek words used, or in their Hebrew equivalents, to support these interpretations; *e.g.* πλούσιος in the LXX is usually the rendering of עשיר or the corresponding verb (20 times), and Driver has pointed out that עשיר is never used in the O.T. as the opposite of עני.<sup>b</sup> It is generally opposed to רש, which is the one Hebrew word that distinctly expresses the idea

<sup>a</sup> Usually καθαρός in the LXX is a translation of טָהוֹר, and bears a ceremonial sense.

<sup>b</sup> Art. 'Poor,' Hastings' *D.B.* vol. 4.



of literal poverty. This leads one to suspect that in our Greek Woes we have not a rendering faithful to the import of the Aramaic of our Lord.

Looking back upon these Beatitudes and Woes, we see that it is upon inward dispositions of heart that they lay stress. External conditions are indeed implied in the first Beatitude and the first Woe and are expressed in the last two Beatitudes and the last Woe. But these too, in their inner meaning, seem to refer not so much to the conditions in themselves as to the character revealed by the conditions. It might be thought that in pronouncing these conditions blessed our Lord was thinking of the effects upon character of the patient endurance of them. But the words 'for the Son of man's sake,' the comparisons of the prophets and the false prophets, and the great stress in Christ's teaching generally on persecution as the necessary consequence of true devotion to Himself, seem to make it probable that at least the main thought in Christ's mind was that these conditions are blessed because they are evidence of the possession of inward characteristics which are such.<sup>a</sup>

This interpretation is supported by a consideration of the meaning of the word 'blessed' as here used by our Lord. It is evidently not synonymous with 'happy,' for blessedness is predicated of those whose outward conditions of life are productive of unhappiness. Now the word μακάριος in the LXX is always the translation of אֲשֵׁרִי. And of the 45 instances where it occurs in the O.T., 26 are in the Psalms. Probably, then, it was the Aramaic equivalent of this word which Christ used, and its use in the Psalms may have been specially in His mind. Now there are indeed one or two instances of the use of אֲשֵׁרִי where it may denote the happiness which is the result of material blessings—*e.g.* 'Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them' in Ps. 127<sup>5</sup>. But nearly always it denotes the well-being of a man's spirit, which is the result not of his circumstances in the world or anything outside

<sup>a</sup> It might be thought that the change of tense from the present to the perfect in the words 'have been persecuted' indicates that our Lord is thinking of a certain temper fostered by the infliction of wrong. But this inference cannot be pressed since the Hebrew and Aramaic participles are properly timeless.

himself, but of his religious and moral state. It is the consciousness of a right relationship towards God and man; *e.g.* it is repeatedly pronounced upon those who put their trust in God (Pss. 2<sup>12</sup>, 34<sup>8</sup>, 40<sup>4</sup>, 84<sup>12</sup>), and also on those who fear God (Pss. 112<sup>1</sup>, 128<sup>1</sup>), who wait for God (Is. 30<sup>18</sup>), whose strength is in God (Ps. 84<sup>5</sup>), whom God chastens (Ps. 44<sup>12</sup>), whose transgressions are forgiven (Ps. 32<sup>1-2</sup>), who do not walk in the counsel of the ungodly (Ps. 1<sup>1</sup>), who do righteousness (Ps. 106<sup>3</sup>, Is. 56<sup>1-2</sup>), who walk in the law of the Lord (Ps. 119<sup>1</sup>), keep wisdom's ways (Prov. 8<sup>32</sup>), and consider the poor and needy (Ps. 41<sup>1</sup>). It is in the same sense, *viz.* of a happiness in God which is the result of spiritual and moral qualities, that μακάριος is elsewhere used in the N.T., both by our Lord and others; *e.g.* Christ declares those blessed who are not made to stumble by Him, those who hear the word of God and keep it, Peter in his Great Confession, those who give rather than those who receive (Mt. 11<sup>6</sup>, Lk. 11<sup>28</sup>, Mt. 16<sup>17</sup>, Acts 20<sup>35</sup>), etc.; Elizabeth pronounces Mary blessed because she believed the message of Gabriel (Lk. 1<sup>45</sup>); St. Paul quotes Ps. 32<sup>1-2</sup> in Rom. 4<sup>7-8</sup>; St. James pronounces blessing on the man who endures temptation, and St. John on those who die in the Lord, who keep the words of the prophecy in his book, who wash their robes (Jas. 1<sup>12</sup>, Rev. 14<sup>13</sup>, 22<sup>7,14</sup>), etc. It is in the same sense, we may safely infer, that our Lord's hearers would understand the pronouncements of blessing in the Beatitudes of the Sermon. And no doubt the pronouncements of woe would convey to them the opposite idea.

The words μακάριος and οὐαί thus understood accord with the enunciation of inward dispositions in the Beatitudes and Woes. It is clear that no condition of life, however conducive it may be to blessedness or its opposite, necessarily results in the one state or the other. But our moral sense declares it to be absolutely true that some inward dispositions are inherently blessed, and others the reverse.

To each of the Beatitudes a promise is attached. These promises are expressed in language much influenced by the current Messianic Hope. In all of them the verb is in the future, except in the first and eighth, where it is present, and the ninth, where it is not expressed. But probably in

the Aramaic the verb was not expressed in the first and eighth, as well as the ninth. In any case the hearers would probably understand the coming of the Kingdom to be in the future, although in the near future, and probably in their lifetime. For, as Dalman says, 'the "sovereignty of God" is for Jesus invariably an eschatological entity, of which a present can be predicted only because "the end" is already approaching' ('Words of Jesus,' p. 135).

The promise of the 'kingdom of heaven' stands both first and last. This indicates its importance. All the others seem to be, either included within it as aspects and elements of the future good, or else substantially equivalent to it. In the latter class we should place the promise to the meek. The hearers would understand it as referring to participation in the collective blessings of salvation, as may be seen from the passage of Ethiopic Enoch quoted in the last chapter, and from other parallels.<sup>a</sup> There is thus a remarkable parallelism between the whole of the Beatitudes pronounced upon the poor and the meek. Perhaps also we should place in the same category the promises of the seventh and ninth Beatitudes. A comparison of the expression 'sons of God' with the similar expressions in Mt. 13<sup>38</sup>, Lk. 20<sup>36</sup>, and Wisd. Sol. 5<sup>5</sup> suggests that it may be equivalent here to 'inheritors of the Kingdom.'<sup>b</sup> In the last promise, the words 'in Heaven' are, according to Dalman, synonymous for 'with God.'<sup>c</sup> If so, the form of words in which this promise is couched leaves it open to us to understand the reward as referring to participation in the expected Kingdom. The promise to the pure in heart, 'for they shall see God,' might be thought to look beyond life in the Kingdom to the beatific vision of Heaven above. It is in this sense that St. John speaks of seeing God's face (Rev. 22<sup>4</sup>; cf. 1 Jn. 3<sup>3</sup>). But it does not seem probable that the hearers would so interpret Christ's promise. Rather would they interpret it of fellowship with God in the Kingdom upon earth (cf. Ps. 17<sup>15</sup>). So understood, this

<sup>a</sup> See p. 143; cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus* (Engl. ed.), pp. 126-127; Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (Engl. transl.), div. 2, vol. ii. p. 172.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*, vol. ii. p. 482.

<sup>c</sup> *Words of Jesus*, p. 206.

promise falls into line with the rest as referring to the blessedness of participation in the coming Kingdom.

The popular conception of this Kingdom was a more or less material and national one, and into the picture of future blessedness which our Lord's words would call up to His hearers' minds, outward conditions of life doubtless entered. It is not, however, upon these, but upon the spiritual side, that the promises lay stress.

There is no necessary inconsistency between the promises thus understood and the pronouncements of blessedness. For it is not needful to suppose that the conjunction  $\delta\tau\iota$  implies that the blessedness consists solely in the obtaining of these promises. Whilst they are future the blessedness follows as an immediate result from the inner dispositions described. 'The promise represents the gift of grace by Christ in the new Kingdom, as adapted to each case.'<sup>a</sup> In fact, the force of  $\delta\tau\iota$  here seems to be 'and the proof of it is' rather than 'and the reason of it is' (*cf.* the use of  $\delta\tau\iota$  in Lk. 7<sup>47</sup>).<sup>b</sup>

2. THE REVISION OF MORAL STANDARDS.—The first verse of this section states in general terms the mission which our Lord claims in regard to the Jewish Scriptures. He came, not to annul or abrogate them, but to make them complete or perfect. In the illustrations of this making perfect which follow it is seen to consist in the bringing of teaching to completion and not in the fulfilment of promises or prophecies. Perhaps  $\text{כִּמְלֵךְ}$  was the Aramaic word used by our Lord. It means properly 'to complete' (and so might well be rendered into Greek by  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ );<sup>c</sup> but was commonly used in the sense of 'expounding fully.' We may infer from  $\mu\eta\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$  that some supposed that Christ claimed to abrogate the teaching of the O.T. Such an impression might naturally be created by His tone of unlimited personal authority, His breach of Sabbath regulations, the non-observance of fasting by His disciples, etc.

<sup>a</sup> Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, p. 529.

<sup>b</sup> The  $\delta\tau\iota$  of the last Beatitude however (in the phrase  $\delta\tau\iota\ \acute{o}\ \mu\iota\sigma\theta\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ) bears the meaning 'because.'

<sup>c</sup> In the LXX, however,  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu$  is not found as the translation of the corresponding Hebrew  $\text{כִּמְלֵךְ}$ . The Hebrew word occurs five times in the O.T., the Aramaic word only in Ezra 7<sup>12</sup>.



It would be profoundly disturbing to Jewish minds, with whom the eternity of the Law was an axiom. The passages quoted in the last chapter may be supplemented by 2 Esdras 9<sup>36-37</sup> 'We who have received the Law and sinned must perish, together with our heart, which has taken it in: the Law, however, perishes not, but abides in its glory'; and Baruch 4<sup>1-2</sup> 'This is the book of the commandments of God, And the law that endureth for ever: All they that hold it fast are appointed to life; But such as leave it shall die.' 'It was the opinion of the nation concerning the Messias,' says Dr. John Lightfoot, 'that he would bring in a new law, but not at all to the prejudice or damage of Moses and the prophets: but that he would advance the Mosaic law to the very highest pitch, and would fulfil those things that were foretold by the prophets, and that according to the letter, even to the greatest pomp.'<sup>a</sup> Thus our Lord's statement of His mission in the Sermon agrees with the expectations which were current concerning the Messiah.

This is the first use in St. Matthew of ἄλθον by our Lord. Each of the Gospels places the word upon His lips, but Matthew does so more frequently than the other two Synoptists. It implies His consciousness of a mission from the Father, but hardly His pre-existence. The same word is used of the Baptist (Mt. 11<sup>18</sup>, 17<sup>10-12</sup>, 21<sup>32</sup>, Jn. 1<sup>7</sup>).

(a) *The Law of Murder.* The introductory formula ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη (τοῖς ἀρχαίοις) to this and each of the other laws, where γέγραπται might have been expected, is not to be explained on the ground of the hearers' ignorance of reading. Reading of the Bible, and especially of the Pentateuch, was one of the principal subjects of instruction in the Jewish elementary schools. The saying in Pirké Aboth 5<sup>27</sup> on the Ages of Man begins thus: 'At five years old one is fit for the Scripture' (למקרא); and Josephus c. Apionem 2<sup>25</sup> writes: καὶ γράμματα (i.e. reading and writing) παιδεύειν ἐκέλευσε [*scil.* τοὺς παῖδας], περὶ τε τοὺς νόμους ἀναστρέφειν καὶ τῶν προγόνων τὰς πράξεις ἐπίστασθαι, τὰς μὲν ἵνα μιμῶνται, τοῖς δ' ἵνα συντρεφόμενοι μήτε παραβαίνωσι

<sup>a</sup> *Horae Hebr.* (Gandell's ed.), vol. ii. p. 99.

μήτε σαῖψιν ἀγνοίας ἔχωσι. cf. 1<sup>12</sup>, 2<sup>18</sup>, 2 Tim. 3<sup>15</sup>. The Jewish schools were open to boys only, but girls were taught to read at home.\* As knowledge of the Law was esteemed the chief thing in Jewish education, great importance could not fail to be attached to the ability to read it.

Why, then, does our Lord thus express Himself? It is because He is appealing to what His hearers had been taught rather than to what they had read for themselves in the O.T. Consonant with this is the fact that 'the particular passages of the law which are here cited by our Saviour are not produced as the bare words of Moses, but as clothed in the glosses of the Scribes.'<sup>b</sup> The contrast which He draws is between the Rabbinical interpretations of these laws and His own, even where the former merely enforced the literal observance of the legal precept.

Dr. Abrahams has noted that in the exegetical terminology of R. Ishmael (end of first century) there is a constantly recurring phrase which runs thus: 'The text reads so and so. I *hear* from it so and so: *but* other texts prove that this is not its true meaning' (תלמוד לומר . . . . . (שומע אני), and that this formula is used for introducing a 'second sense' in mitigation or expansion of the letter of the text.<sup>c</sup> It seems probable that, as he suggests, this formula underlies our Lord's recurring phrase, 'Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say unto you.' In any case it offers an interesting parallel to it. If our Lord did adopt it, He also significantly altered it, for, whilst it was intended to exclude the personal authority of the teacher, our Lord lays all stress on His own authority.

τοῖς ἀρχαίοις may be understood, either 'to them of old time' (R.V.), or 'by them of old time' (A.V.). Perhaps the former is preferable, because the words seem to contrast more naturally with οὖν in the next clause than with ἐγώ.

The words 'Thou shalt not kill' agree with the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, Ex. 20<sup>13</sup>, Deut. 5<sup>17</sup>; but the remaining words, 'and whosoever shall kill shall be

\* See G. H. Box in *Enc. Bibl.* p. 1201.

<sup>b</sup> Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 107.

<sup>c</sup> *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, First Series, p. 16; *Cambridge Bibl. Essays*, 1909, p. 176.

in danger of the judgement,' are not a quotation from the O.T. We shall consider presently the meaning of 'judgement' here.

The main thought of Christ in the words which follow is clear. He extends the scope of the sixth commandment to the inclusion of even the feeling of anger towards a brother. The three instances of guilt are plainly intended to form a climactic series. The first degree is the temporary hatred which we call anger: then comes the expression of it in the word 'Ρακά, and finally that in the word Μωρέ. 'Ρακά is evidently a transliteration of רִיקָא. This word, which literally means 'empty,' is of frequent occurrence in Rabbinic writings in the sense of 'empty-head' and was a common term of contempt; *e.g.* the following passage is quoted, amongst others, by J. Lightfoot in illustration: 'A king's daughter was married to a certain dirty fellow. He commands her to stand by him as a mean servant, and to be his butler. To whom she said, *Raca*, I am a king's daughter.'<sup>a</sup> It is natural to suppose that Μωρέ is also a transliteration, and that it represents the Hebrew מָרָה. But it is difficult to believe that this is the case, for מָרָה means 'murmuring,' 'refractory,' which does not appear to be a suitable sense in this connexion, and there is no evidence that it was a common term of opprobrium. Probably then Μωρέ is a translation, and means 'fool.' As in the LXX Μωρέ is a rendering of נָבֵל, this word may well express the meaning of the epithet in this connexion. נָבֵל is used to denote a godless and immoral person, *e.g.* in Ps. 14<sup>1</sup>. It is a stronger term than 'Ρακά, which implies rather intellectual worthlessness. J. Lightfoot thus distinguishes between the two terms: 'Raca denotes indeed *morosity*, and *lightness of manners and life*: but *fool* judgeth bitterly of the spiritual and eternal state, and decreeth a man to certain destruction.'<sup>b</sup>

The words τῇ κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ and εἰς τὴν γέενναν must represent a climactic series corresponding to the three ascending degrees of guilt. The meaning of τῷ συνεδρίῳ

<sup>a</sup> *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 109, from *Midrash Tillin* upon Ps. 137.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 112.

is not doubtful. It clearly refers to the central Jewish tribunal in Jerusalem.  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , then, will relate to a lesser Jewish court. It would be natural to understand it as referring to the local courts scattered over the land. But there is evidence that these could not adjudicate on murder cases.<sup>a</sup> J. Lightfoot holds that  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$  in both its occurrences in this passage means  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ , and supports his view by quoting several Rabbinic sayings which distinguish between direct and indirect homicide, and leave the latter to be dealt with by the act of God, without any punishment inflicted by the Sanhedrin.<sup>b</sup> This interpretation is attractive but hardly tenable. It is not likely that, if this were the meaning, the qualifying words would have been omitted. The Sanhedrin was clearly a human tribunal, and in a climactic series the divine judgement would not naturally precede the human. And even if the reference to a heavenly tribunal could be sustained in the case of the second occurrence of  $\tau\eta\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , it is hard to think that the first refers to other than a human court; and it would seem very improbable to suppose that the reference in both is not the same. To what, then, do the words refer? The most probable interpretation seems to be that they refer to the 'minor Sanhedrins' consisting of twenty-three members which the Mishna states to have been appointed in every town of a certain population, and to have been empowered to deal with criminal cases of life and death ( $\text{דִּינֵי נַפְשׁוֹת}$ ).<sup>c</sup> It is to these local Sanhedrins that our Lord seems to refer in His instructions to the Twelve (Mt. 10<sup>17</sup>). It may well be, therefore, that here also the reference is to trial before these subordinate courts.

The first two penalties then we take to have, primarily at least, a human reference. Is the same the case with the third? Archbishop Trench thinks that it is. He writes: 'It is a strange marring and misunderstanding of our Lord's words on the part of some . . . to make the two earlier, the "*judgement*" and the "*council*," expressions of

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Josephus *Antt.* bk. 14, c. 9, § 3.

<sup>b</sup> *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. pp. 109-112.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (Engl. transl.), div. 2, vol. i. pp. 153-154.



penalties inflicted by earthly tribunals; and only the third, the "*Gehenna*," that which comes directly from the sentence of God. On the contrary, they are all earthly forms under which the different degrees of loss and injury for the spirit of man, reaching at last to its total loss and perdition,—set forth by the casting out into the place appointed for the burning of the offal of Jerusalem—are described. . . . Therefore our translation "*hell-fire*" is not happy, as somewhat countenancing the confusion; not that the eternal loss is not indicated by our Lord, but since that has twice before been mentioned under forms of things earthly, so should it still have been here.'<sup>a</sup> This is an attractive view, by reason of its symmetry, but it is not probable. The word γέεννα was in common use in N.T. times to denote the final place of punishment of the wicked; cf., e.g., Syr. Apoc. of Baruch 59<sup>10</sup> 'And the mouth of Gehenna, and the station of vengeance, and the place of faith, and the region of hope'; 2 Esdras 7<sup>36</sup> 'And then shall the pit of torment appear, and over against it the place of refreshment; The furnace of Gehenna shall be made manifest, and over against it the Paradise of delight'; Pirké Aboth 5<sup>24</sup> 'The bold-faced man is for Gehenna, and the shame-faced man is for the Garden of Eden.' In every other N.T. passage the word seems clearly to be used in this symbolic sense. Whether this use of the word arose from the throwing of the corpses of criminals into literal fires burning in this valley seems doubtful. The idea that there were such fires perpetually kept up in Hinnom, and that they were used for consuming the dead bodies of criminals as well as the carcasses of animals and the refuse of the city, springs from a statement to this effect by Kimchi. His date is late (c. A.D. 1200), and apart from him there does not appear to be evidence of any fires other than those of Molech having been kept up in this valley.<sup>b</sup> It is however not improbable that the refuse of the city would for sanitary reasons be destroyed by fire. If so, the bodies of criminals may have been cremated in these fires. At any rate, from the allusion to the graves of the children of the

<sup>a</sup> *St. Aug. on the Sermon on the Mount* (3rd ed.), pp. 190–191.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. R. H. Charles, Art. 'Gehenna,' in *Hastings' D.B.*, vol. ii. p. 119.

people in 2 Kings 23<sup>6, 10</sup>, Hinnom would appear to have been near the common burial-place. It is thus possible that to the hearers' minds the picture would have presented itself of the offender's corpse being cast into the literal fires of Hinnom. Be this as it may, they would probably understand a divine penalty to be meant.

In the first two instances ἔνοχος is followed by the dative (τῇ κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ), and the meaning is 'liable to the sentence to be imposed by the tribunal.' In the third case it is followed by εἰς with the accusative (εἰς τὴν γέενναν). We must either understand some such word as βληθῆναι to be implied, or, with J. Lightfoot, give to εἰς the force of 'even unto,' indicating a severer penalty than the preceding.<sup>a</sup>

This triplet of sayings is clearly not meant to teach that the legal penalties of angry feelings and angry words are to be administered by human courts. Trench is doubtless right, in the passage we have quoted, in contending that it is things heavenly which are portrayed under the shadows of things earthly. Still less is it our Lord's meaning that each offence is to be dealt with by the appropriate tribunal with nicety of distinction. It may be indeed that He is here ironically imitating the casuistical distinctions drawn by the Rabbis.

Nor is it legitimate to infer that any special guilt attaches to the use of the two particular epithets which He mentions. As Trench observes, the use by St. James of ὁ ἄνθρωπος κενέ (2<sup>20</sup>), and by our Lord of μωρός (Mt. 23<sup>17</sup>), 'are proofs, if any were needed, that these terms are instanced but as signs of inward states of enmity and scorn: else might a new Pharisaism develop itself out of this very teaching of Christ's; which, as avoiding certain expressly forbidden utterances of outrage and ill will, should count itself free to use any other. But, even as these, where love is, may be righteously and holily used, and Christ and His servants spake the keenest things in love . . . so where love is not, the guilt of "Racha," and "Thou fool," will be incurred not merely where other words are substituted for these, but where no word at all escapes from the lips.'<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 112.

<sup>b</sup> *St. Aug. on the Sermon on the Mount*, p. 189 note.

The purport of our Lord's words is plainly this: that all within man out of which the act of murder takes its rise involves guilt before God and incurs liability to the divine penalty. Here, as with many another of His sayings, the path of literalism leads us away from His true meaning.

No doubt the word  $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\eta$  which we have omitted from our Q text expresses a qualification consonant with our Lord's meaning. He who looked round with anger on the Pharisees in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 3<sup>5</sup>) can hardly have meant to condemn all anger absolutely.

It is worthy of notice that in each of these sayings it is against a 'brother' that the offence is supposed to be committed. Now in the O.T.  $\pi\alpha$  always presupposes some special bond of brotherhood and is frequently used to denote one belonging to the same race, a fellow-Jew. Similarly, in the N.T.  $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$  never appears to denote simply a fellow-man as such, but is constantly used of a fellow-Christian. At this early stage, however, it is probably in accordance with the O.T. usage that the hearers would understand our Lord, both in this passage and in Mt. 5<sup>47</sup>, and Mt. 7<sup>3-5</sup> = Lk. 6<sup>41-42</sup>. His words here would perhaps recall to their minds the precept of Lev. 19<sup>17</sup>.

(b) *The Law of Adultery.* Our Lord's perfecting of the seventh commandment is of the same nature as that of the sixth. The scope of the precept of Exod. 20<sup>41</sup>, Deut. 5<sup>18</sup> is extended so as to include even the looking on a woman with sexual desire. The primary reference seems clearly to be to cases where the gratification of the desire would involve adultery, *i.e.* where either the man or the woman, or both, are already married. The point of the words is that the sin of adultery is not confined to its physical committal. It includes even the lustful gaze which, although it may be in no way further gratified, would, if it were gratified, lead to the literal breach of the commandment. It would be possible to translate  $\gammaυν\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha$  'wife,' and to render 'every one that looketh on a married woman,' etc. This is not likely, although the commandment was interpreted by the Jews to mean 'That no man lie with another man's wife.'<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 118.

πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι is understood by Augustine to mean 'in order to excite or feed lustful feelings.' The following passage from his treatise on the Sermon on the Mount is quoted by Trench : 'Non dixit, Omnis qui concupiverit mulierem, sed qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam : id est, hoc fine et hoc animo attenderit, ut eam concupiscat' (i. 12). Trench supports Augustine's interpretation, pointing out that πρὸς τό = *eo ut*, and differs from εἰς τό = *ita ut*. 'In the first, which stands here,' he says, 'is involved not merely the event, but also the intention.'<sup>a</sup> Taking the words quite literally, this is what they mean. But it seems more natural and more in accordance with psychological fact to interpret πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς 'with sexual desire.' The expression seems to be condensed, and πρὸς to indicate rather the object towards whom the desire is directed. In this case the stress is on the presence of the desire and not on the look. The force of the mention of the look seems to be that, even if the desire has only been gratified to the extent of a lustful look, there is guilt. Still, it is noticeable that the words here are not exactly parallel with those above on anger. There our Lord began with 'whosoever is angry with his brother' simply; here He does not condemn the feeling of lust apart from some yielding to it.

For the construction of μοιχεύειν with the accusative in the sense of 'commit adultery with' we may compare Lev. 20<sup>10</sup> LXX.

(c) *The Law of Oaths.* All the O.T. teaching about oaths goes back to the third commandment. But the words οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις seem to refer to Lev. 19<sup>12</sup>, where the LXX reads καὶ οὐκ ὀμείσθῃς τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐπ' ἄδικον. Our Lord's second clause is not a direct quotation but an addition similar to that to the sixth commandment above. ἀποδοῦναι is often used in the LXX of the fulfilment of vows,<sup>b</sup> and the sense requires that we should understand ὅρκους here to refer to promissory oaths. It is a natural inference that the primary reference of Ναὶ ναί, Οὐ οὐ is also to promises rather than to statements of fact.

<sup>a</sup> St. Aug. on the Sermon on the Mount, p. 199 note.

<sup>b</sup> E.g. in Job 22<sup>27</sup>, Pss. 50<sup>14</sup>, 61<sup>9</sup>, 66<sup>13</sup>, 116<sup>18</sup>, Eccles. 5<sup>4</sup>, Eccus. 18<sup>22</sup>.



The natural rendering of the Greek here is 'Let your speech be Yea, yea, Nay, nay,' *i.e.* an emphatic promise without oath. It seems to be equally natural to understand the second particles in Jas. 5<sup>12</sup> as used predicatively, 'Let your yea be yea and your nay nay,' and there are parallels to this use in Jewish literature. Dean Savage is inclined to bring the words here into line with this usage, and to render 'Let your speech be (as to) Yea, Yea and (as to) Nay, Nay.'<sup>a</sup> But the striking parallel from Slavonic Enoch quoted in the last chapter contains an example of the use of the emphatic 'Yea, yea, Nay, nay,' and this usage is not unknown in the Rabbinic literature.<sup>b</sup> Moreover, it is clearly in this sense that the words are used in 2 Cor. 1<sup>17</sup>. The natural rendering therefore seems preferable.

Each of the four oaths specified contains no direct mention of God. Evasive oaths of this kind were in common use, and parallels are found in Jewish literature for each of the circumlocutions for the divine name.<sup>c</sup>

Some of the Rabbis taught that these lesser oaths were not binding. Christ's direct condemnation of such casuistical distinctions is recorded in Mt. 23<sup>16-22</sup>. In the passage before us He shows that these evasive oaths involve the calling of God to witness; the heaven is the throne of God, the earth is the footstool of His feet (*cf.* Is. 66<sup>1</sup>), Jerusalem is God's city (*cf.* Ps. 48<sup>2</sup>). The force of His comment on the fourth kind of oath (*viz.* that by one's head) seems to be that here too we implicitly call God to witness, for we are absolutely in His hand. We cannot escape from His control, even to the extent of changing the colour of a single hair of our head. As the heaven and the earth and Jerusalem belong to Him, so do we ourselves also. These examples would make it plain to the hearers that the prohibition of swearing not only applied to the more solemn oaths in which God was directly involved, but that it also included all the lesser and more trivial forms in which He was not directly called to witness.

τοῦ πονηροῦ should probably be considered as masculine

<sup>a</sup> *Gospel of the Kingdom*, pp. 119, 120.

<sup>b</sup> See p. 156, and *cf.* Savage, *op. cit.* p. 120.

<sup>c</sup> For references see Savage, *op. cit.* p. 117.

and not neuter. In several N.T. passages this is the only possible rendering, and it seems more in accordance with Jewish modes of thought to interpret the originating influence here of the author of evil than of an abstract principle.

(d) *The Law of Retaliation*.—The *lex talionis* is laid down in several O.T. passages. If we may suppose that our Lord had any one of these specially in mind, it is perhaps more probable that this was Lev. 24<sup>17-21</sup> than that it was Ex. 21<sup>23-25</sup> or Deut. 19<sup>21</sup>, because in the latter it is laid down as to be applied to particular wrongs, whilst in Leviticus it is stated as a more general principle, to be acted upon where a man inflicts on his neighbour any bodily hurt.

In the precept  $\mu\eta\ \alpha\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\tilde{\omega},\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\tilde{\omega}$  is probably masculine, and means 'the wicked person who injures you.' The prohibition contained in  $\mu\eta\ \alpha\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$  goes beyond that of requital. It is possible to refrain from requiting those who injure us and still to resist them. The precepts which follow go beyond even non-resistance. The first definitely enjoins the offering of the other cheek. If we are not to understand that our Lord enjoins also in the others the offering of the cloke and of the second mile's journey, at least He teaches willingness to submit to a still greater measure of personal wrong than the evil man had it in mind to impose.

The first illustration of non-resistance is a case of physical assault. To smite a Jew on the cheek was to offer him a gross insult. In the remarkable parallel of Lam. 3<sup>30</sup> the precept 'Let him give his cheek to him that smiteth him' is immediately followed by the words 'Let him be filled full with reproach,' and it forms the climax of the discipline enjoined in the triplet of verses 3<sup>28-30</sup>. Cf. also Is. 50<sup>6</sup>; 2 Cor. 12<sup>20</sup>.

The second illustration alludes to a wrong enacted by the power of the Law. Probably it is implied that the coat is unjustly taken, although in accordance with the judgement of the court. And perhaps our Lord is anticipating the time when the courts of law would give unfair decisions against His followers. But it is possible that we should understand the coat to be taken in pledge. If so, we have

here a case of legal oppression, for it was considered a very oppressive act that a man's clothing should be seized for this purpose (*cf.* Job 22<sup>5-6</sup>, 24<sup>9-10</sup>).

The ἱμάτιον which Christ bids His disciples to give is the שְׂמָלָה or outer cloke, and is a more valuable garment than the χιτῶν or כְּתָנִיָּה, which was the tunic-coat.<sup>a</sup>

The third illustration refers to compulsory service. Ἀγγαρεύειν is derived from the Persian word for the royal couriers. It had become a technical term for impressment to render public service.<sup>b</sup> We may compare its use in Mk. 15<sup>21</sup> = Mt. 27<sup>32</sup> of the impressment by the Roman soldiers of Simon of Cyrene to carry the Cross.

If we ask what principle guided our Lord in the selection of these particular instances to illustrate His teaching on non-resistance, the words of J. Lightfoot that 'He mentions these particulars which seemed to be the most unworthy, and not to be borne by the high quality of a Jew, that He might the more preach up evangelical humility, and patience, and self-denial' probably give the correct answer.<sup>c</sup>

The precepts here are given without any limitation such as is contained in the word 'brother' in the illustration of the sixth commandment. On the contrary we have twice over the emphatic ὅστις. We may compare the words 'either to neighbour or enemy' in the parallel from Slavonic Enoch 50<sup>3-4</sup> quoted on pp. 157, 158.

We cannot be certain that the following injunctions, 'Give to him that asketh thee,' etc., followed immediately in the original Discourse. As they stand, they seem to be further illustrations of non-resistance to evil. If so, the evil here will consist in unreasonable or unjust demands, with perhaps threats of violence in case of non-compliance. But it may be that it is voluntary charity which is here enjoined. If so, is it still the πονηρός that we are to think of as the recipient? If it is, the thought is parallel to that of Prov. 25<sup>21-22</sup>. It is interesting, however, to notice that in the parallel from Slavonic Enoch 9<sup>1</sup> quoted on p. 158 the thought passes from that of the endurance of evil to

<sup>a</sup> *Cf.* Mackie, Art. 'Dress' in Hastings' *D.B.* vol. i. pp. 624, 625.

<sup>b</sup> *Cf.* Savage, *Gospel of the Kingdom*, pp. 136 ff.

<sup>c</sup> *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. pp. 130, 131.

that of an active charity to the hungry and the naked. Perhaps there is the same transition in this passage of the Sermon, and in these later words there is no thought of either the evil man or his unrighteous demands.

If we so interpret 'Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away,' it is possible that the Golden Rule followed these precepts in the actual Discourse. It is not conceivable that the Rule succeeded precepts enjoining non-resistance to evil, for the principle of non-resistance to evil lies outside the scope of the Rule. The words 'as ye would that men should do unto you' must be understood to refer to such wishes as are lawful and right, and the wish that others should offer no resistance to any evil which we may impose upon them is not lawful and right.

(e) *The Law of Love and Hatred.* 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour' is found in Lev. 19<sup>18</sup> with the words 'as thyself' added. This is the highest expression of the law of neighbourhood contained in the O.T., and it is several times quoted in the N.T.

The added words 'and hate thine enemy' are nowhere found in the O.T. In what sense are they to be understood? 'Enemy' cannot refer to a fellow-Jew who is a purely personal enemy. Many O.T. passages restrict hatred towards such enemies—e.g. Ex. 23<sup>4-5</sup>, Job 31<sup>29-30</sup>, Prov. 20<sup>22</sup>, 24<sup>29</sup>, and especially 25<sup>21-22</sup>. Lev. 19<sup>17-18</sup> also is very definite. In the later Jewish literature we may compare Ecclus. 28<sup>1-5</sup> and Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Gad 6<sup>3-4</sup>, 7. But in regard to the Gentile the case is different, as the passages quoted on p. 160 sufficiently show. In the period following the Captivity the national and religious exclusiveness of the Jews grew further in intensity. It was inflamed by patriotic resentment against foreign conquerors and oppressors, and by religious repugnance to the intrusion of heathen customs. So bitter was the national aloofness cultivated by the Jews of the first century that St. Paul can speak of them as *πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίοι* (1 Thess. 2<sup>15</sup>).<sup>a</sup> It is therefore of the

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 1: *μόνους γὰρ ἀπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀκουωνήτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐπιμιξίας καὶ πολεμίους ὑπολαμβάνειν πάντας.*



man of alien race and religion that the words are to be understood.

This reference of the word 'enemy' is supported by a consideration of the connotation of 'neighbour.' It is clear that in Lev. 19<sup>18</sup> 'neighbour' is co-extensive with 'the children of thy people,' *i.e.* it denotes a fellow-Jew. But there is probably contained in the word ἐχθρός the further idea of actual hostility in the alien. For the exact opposite of 'neighbour' in the sense of 'compatriot' is 'foreigner' or 'alien' (נָכָר, נְכָרִי or בֶּן-נָכָר, זָר) and is expressed in the LXX by such terms as ἀλλότριος, ἀλλογενής, ἀλλόφυλος, or ξένος. Thus we may interpret the whole, 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy brother-Jew, and hate the alien who is hostile to thy race and religion.' In this sense the Jews had no doubt been taught to hate their enemies. They regarded such as the enemies of God (*cf.* Ps. 139<sup>19-22</sup>).

Probably it is in the same sense that the hearers would understand the word 'enemy' in the precept 'love your enemies,' although our Lord may well have been thinking of those, whether Jews or Gentiles, who would bear hostility against His followers on the ground of their devotion to Himself. At least the following clause 'and pray for those who persecute (*i.e.* harass or molest) you' shows that the idea of hatred and hostility is prominent in His mind, and the following words seem to imply that πονηρία and ἀδικία as well as hostility enter into the idea of the ἐχθρός whom we are bidden to love and to pray for.

So in the words 'If ye salute your brethren only,' ἀδελφούς would to the hearers mean 'fellow-countrymen,' and the following words, 'Even the Gentiles do the same,' would mean that they show good-will to those of the same race as themselves. But our Lord may well have been thinking of the bond of brotherhood which was to unite His disciples, whatever their nationality.

The closing admonition, 'Be ye merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful,' is an exhortation to imitate the divine pity and compassion (רַחֵם). In form it is similar to the Levitical precept of Lev. 11<sup>44</sup>, etc. It does not connect well with its context, for above, when the aim is

set before us 'that ye may become sons of your Father which is in heaven' (*i.e.* morally like Him), it is not the divine pity but the divine universality in the bestowal of benefits that is illustrated by the sun and the rain. And the purport of the whole passage is, not that we should show pity, but that we should extend our love and our prayers even to those who hate and persecute us.

The fourth and fifth illustrations present a great similarity, and the interpretation we give of the one has a bearing upon that of the other. If it seems probable that what our Lord had in mind in the fifth, at least chiefly, was the persecution of His disciples for the sake of the religion which He was teaching them, this affords a presumption that the same holds good of His precepts on non-resistance to evil in the fourth illustration. There is much in favour of adopting this interpretation.

(1) The thought of suffering at the hands of men, and of the merit of suffering, is prominent in the Sermon. It is present, as we have seen, in the first two Beatitudes (upon the poor and the meek), and in the last two ; and it also runs through the last two illustrations of the revision of moral standards. Now in one of these passages, viz. the ninth Beatitude, it is quite clear that the persecution is for the sake of religion ; it is explicitly stated to be 'for the Son of man's sake,' and is compared with that of the O.T. prophets. It is natural to regard this passage as governing the interpretation of the others, and in this connexion it is interesting to notice that there is a good deal of similarity between the language of the last Beatitude and that of the passages on non-resistance and love to enemies (*cf.* the use in both of *μισεῖν, διώκειν, πονηρός, μισθός, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς = οὐράνιος*). In the passage on non-resistance, the *lex talionis* certainly has a general reference to all injuries, irrespective of the motive which may actuate them. It might be inferred that in our Lord's revision of that law the precepts should be regarded as having a reference equally general. But this is a precarious inference. The *πονηρός* in the phrase *ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* may correspond in meaning to the *עָשָׂר* of the O.T.,\* who is often represented

\* This is the rendering of Delitzsch in his Hebrew N.T.

as the oppressor of the צדיק, and the first two instances given of submission, if not the third also, seem to be particularly consonant with this supposition, for they appear to indicate bitterness and hatred as the actuating motive.

(2) From a merely human point of view, there was a great deal in the experiences of our Lord's previous incarnate life which must have deeply impressed it upon Him that He and His followers were bound to suffer for righteousness' sake. Even the aged Simeon who received Him into his arms in the Temple when He was presented to the Lord foresaw that He should be 'for a sign that is spoken against,' and foreshadowed His sufferings (Lk. 2<sup>34-35</sup>). The sojourn in Egypt to escape Herod's massacre must have impressed Him in early boyhood. When able to read He would learn how His race had treated the Prophets of God. The opposition to the Baptist, and his imprisonment by Antipas in Machaerus, must have profoundly moved Him. He had Himself already experienced the growing enmity of men, which had culminated in the recent experiences related in Lk. 4<sup>16-30</sup> and Mk. 3<sup>6</sup> and parallels. Although we read in Mk. 8<sup>31</sup> ff. and parallels that He then first began to teach His disciples explicitly about His coming sufferings and death, it is probable that the foreknowledge of these things in His consciousness long antedated His teaching of them to the Twelve.<sup>a</sup>

(3) The thought that it is always the lot of the righteous to be maltreated, and that accordingly He and His followers must suffer for righteousness' sake, is a very prominent one in all our Lord's teaching. To illustrate this it may be well to bring together the most striking of the relevant sayings which were delivered subsequently to the Sermon. He taught that His disciples must share His cross (Mk. 8<sup>34</sup> ff. and parallels; Mt. 10<sup>25</sup>, cf. Mk. 10<sup>38-39</sup> = Mt. 20<sup>22-23</sup>), that they would be delivered up to councils, be beaten in synagogues, and stand before governors and kings

<sup>a</sup> For He repeatedly connected His own sufferings and those of the Baptist with O.T. prophecies: cf. Mk. 9<sup>12-13</sup> = Mt. 17<sup>11-12</sup>; Mk. 14<sup>21</sup> and parallels; Mk. 14<sup>49b</sup> = Mt. 26<sup>56</sup>; Lk. 24<sup>26-27, 44-46</sup>.

for His name's sake; that they would be put to death by even their next of kin and that they would be hated of all men for His name's sake (Mk. 13<sup>9-13</sup> and parallels; *cf.* Mt. 10<sup>34-36</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>51-53</sup>, Mk. 4<sup>17</sup> and parallels, and Jn. 16<sup>2</sup>). This was because they were not of the world, as He was not of the world (Jn. 15<sup>18-21</sup>, 17<sup>14</sup>). He saw that all the servants of God among His race in the past had been persecuted and maltreated (*cf.* Mk. 12<sup>1-12</sup> and parallels; Mt. 22<sup>6</sup>; Mt. 23<sup>37</sup> = Lk. 13<sup>34</sup>). In Mt. 23<sup>29-36</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>47-51</sup> He seems to teach that He foresees similar persecutions to theirs to be in store for His prophets and apostles (Matthew: 'wise men and scribes'). From Mt. 10<sup>16</sup> = Lk. 10<sup>3</sup> we learn that He regarded His disciples' position in the world as similar to that of sheep (Luke: 'lambs') in the midst of wolves. In fact, wherever He predicts for His adherents evil treatment at the hands of their fellows, the evil of which He speaks is of the nature of religious persecution. This appears from the terminology used to describe it; *e.g.* it is 'for righteousness' sake,' 'for the Son of man's sake,' 'for my name's sake,' or 'for my sake' and 'because ye are not of the world.'

We infer from these considerations that probably in each of the Sermon references to ill-treatment at the hands of men, our Lord was thinking, at least in the main, of the hatred and persecution which would be directed against His followers on account of their religion.

III. WARNINGS AGAINST CRITICISING OTHERS.—The precise limits of this section are not very clearly defined by the subject-matter. From Luke's wording it might appear as though the precept 'Be ye merciful' was the beginning of a fresh division of the Discourse (*cf.* the text of Westcott and Hort). But probably Matthew is right in making the break after and not before this precept. Indeed, it seems to occupy a position in relation to the fifth example of fulfilment, corresponding to those of the injunction 'Let your yea be yea,' etc., in relation to the third, and of the Golden Rule in relation to the fourth.

The saying of Mt. 7<sup>6</sup>, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs,' etc., seems to attach itself to the following matter



rather than to the preceding. We have accordingly placed it in the next division of the Sermon. But from the point we have now reached onwards, the connexion of thought between the different sayings is less clear than it has hitherto been, and it is precarious to build upon such links of thought between one saying and another as their juxtaposition in our reconstructed Q may suggest.

The sayings of this latter portion of the Discourse are less paradoxical than those of the earlier. They would not in the same degree strike the hearers as novel and arresting. To most of them close parallels are to be found in the Jewish literature, and several were current Rabbinic proverbs.

Of the four opening precepts, the first two are parallel, and should probably be regarded as practically synonymous. For the use of κρίνειν in the sense of 'judge adversely,' we may compare Rom. 2<sup>1, 3</sup>. Ἀπολύετε will mean the opposite of 'condemn,' viz. 'acquit,' 'think charitably of.' For the fourth precept we might have expected 'forgive' rather than 'give,' but the following words require the idea of giving to lead up to them. The language here is clearly taken from the measuring of corn. Δώσουσιν seems to refer to God, and to be an instance of what Dalman calls 'evasive or precautionary modes of referring to God' (cf. ἀπαιτοῦσιν in Lk. 12<sup>20</sup>, and αἰτήσουσιν in Lk. 12<sup>48</sup>).

It seems probable that the hearers would understand the reference of κρίνειν in the saying 'with what judgement ye judge ye shall be judged' to be to adverse, condemning judgement, as before. It is possible that the parallel saying, 'with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you,' would be understood by them as having the same reference. But it is not necessary to suppose this, on the ground that if the words are taken as referring to releasing they are inconsistent with the preceding words about 'measure,' which speak of an overflowing recompense, and not of an exact quantitative equivalent. Probably the hearers would understand the words in a qualitative, and not in a quantitative, sense.<sup>a</sup> The saying was 'a very common proverb among

<sup>a</sup> The criticism of Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*. vol. ii. p. 893 (taken from Weiss), therefore seems uncalled for.

the Jews,'<sup>a</sup> and so may have here a general reference, including the meting out both of good and of bad. The proverb, however, was usually applied by the Jews (though not always) to the reciprocal action of men, and not to the retributive justice of God.<sup>b</sup> But probably it is the latter that the hearers would understand to be meant throughout this passage. And this harmonises with the fact that in other parts of Christ's teaching the future attitude of God towards men is represented as being in accordance with their present attitude towards their fellow-men; *cf.* the Beatitude, 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy,' and the teaching of Mt. 6<sup>14-15</sup>. (So also in the Testament of Zeb. 5<sup>3</sup>, we read Ἐχετε οὖν ἔλεος ἐν σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν, ὅτι εἴ τι ἂν ποιήσῃ τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, οὕτω Κύριος ποιήσῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ.)

It is possible that the hearers would specially think of such men as the enemies spoken of in the last section, as those they were not to condemn. So taken, Christ's words have great force and point. But it is doubtful if this special reference was in His mind. In the saying about the mote and the beam which follows, the mote is spoken of as being in the eye of a 'brother' (*cf.* Mt. 5<sup>22, 47</sup>). It is possible that, in giving these precepts, our Lord was thinking rather of the Pharisaic exclusiveness, and contempt of others (*cf.* Jn. 7<sup>49</sup>). If so, it may be that in warning His disciples against condemning, He had in mind their attitude to those of His followers who would not live up to the teachings which He had given them.

The three sayings which follow (the blind guiding the blind, the disciple and the master, and the mote and the beam) are all proverbial. The first is common in Gentile authors as well as Jewish: *cf.* Plato, 'Republic,' bk. 8, § 554<sup>b</sup>—Οὐ γὰρ οἶμαι, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, παιδεία ὁ τοιοῦτος προσέσχηκεν. Οὐ δοκῶ, ἔφη· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τυφλὸν ἡγεμόνα τοῦ χοροῦ ἐστήσατο καὶ ἐτίμα μάλιστα, and the other passages quoted in Wetstein *ad loc.* The second was a common Jewish saying (*cf.* the Rabbinic parallels given in Wetstein *ad loc.*), and the third was in use as a proverb. The interpretation of the last is no doubt correctly given in the Gloss on the saying of

<sup>a</sup> J. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 157.

<sup>b</sup> *Cf.* Savage, *Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 220.

R. Tarphon quoted on p. 164 (we quote from J. Lightfoot, 'Horae Hebr.' vol. ii. p. 158): 'Cast out *the mote*, that is, the small sin that is in thine hand; he may answer, But cast you out the great sin that is in yours. So that they could not reprove, because all were sinners.'

In the connexion in which it here stands, the saying about the disciple not being above his master, along with that about the blind guiding the blind, leads up to the saying about the mote and the beam. The words διδάσκαλος and κύριος seem to refer to Christ's disciples, and μαθητής and δοῦλος to those whom they are to instruct. Our Lord seems to be anticipating the time when His 'pupils' will themselves be 'teachers.' And the purport of the whole passage appears to be that it is futile for them to attempt to reform others until they have reformed themselves.

Our Lord does not seem absolutely to condemn the effort to cast out the mote from a brother's eye, but only so long as there is a beam in the eye of the would-be reformer. The closing words, 'then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye,' seem to teach that when once true self-reformation has been accomplished He approves the effort to bring a fellow-man to see and to forsake his faults. There is thus a clear distinction between the teaching here and that of the opening precepts, 'Judge not,' etc.

It is possible that here also our Lord was specially thinking of the faults of the Pharisees. There are correspondences between the language in these verses and that of Mt. 23; e.g. our Lord there calls the Pharisees hypocrites (vv. 13, 15 etc.), blind guides (v. 16), and reproves them for not practising what they teach (vv. 3-4), and for inwardly being full of hypocrisy and iniquity (vv. 27-28). And here, as in several of the instances of the use of ὑποκριτής in Mt. 23, the classical meaning of the word is clearly not appropriate. There is no notion of pretence or dissimulation, but rather the idea of moral blindness as to self.\*

4. THE DUTY OF DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLISHING SACRED TRUTH. THE GOOD AND THE BAD TREE, AND THE

\* See, on the meaning of 'Hypocrite' in the Gospels, Savage, *Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 148, and Lyttelton, *Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 374-392.

GOOD AND THE BAD HEART.—The striking saying, Mt. 7<sup>6</sup>, has been variously interpreted. So far as we have been able to ascertain, there does not appear to be any close verbal parallel to it in the Talmud. But the precious sayings of the Jewish sages are often called ‘pearls.’<sup>a</sup> It seems probable therefore that the disciples would understand the word ‘pearls’ as referring to precious sayings or teaching. If so, the reference of τὸ ἅγιον also in the first clause is naturally taken to be to holy teaching, the former word laying emphasis on its sacredness, the latter on its preciousness. This interpretation agrees well with the reason which our Lord gives in Mk. 4<sup>11-12</sup> and parallels for speaking in parables. The mystery of the Kingdom of God is taught in parabolic form, so that it may be concealed from ‘them that are without.’

Delitzsch, in his Hebrew N.T., renders τὸ ἅγιον by חֲקִישׁ, which is used in the O.T. of the food offered in sacrifice, of which no unclean person or stranger was allowed to partake (Lev. 22<sup>1-16</sup>). On the other hand it is flesh that has been torn of beasts in the field which the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 22<sup>31</sup>) requires to be cast to the dogs. Perhaps then the picture would be called up in the hearers’ minds of the sacred sacrificial meat being given, like any beast-torn flesh, to the dogs to consume. That would be to them a picture of horrible sacrilege.

The supposition that these specific ideas would be suggested agrees well with the designation in the early Church of the Eucharistic elements by τὰ ἅγια (as in the well-known liturgical formula τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις), and with the application of Christ’s precept, ‘Give not that which is holy to the dogs,’ to the duty of guarding against unworthy reception of the Eucharist, which is found as early as the Didache (c. 9<sup>5</sup>).<sup>b</sup>

As to the reference of the words ‘dogs’ and ‘swine,’

<sup>a</sup> Cf. the Talmudic passages quoted by Savage, *Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 224.

<sup>b</sup> So, too, Cyprian, *Ep.* 31<sup>6</sup>. But it is well to bear in mind that this is not the only application of the words in the early Fathers; e.g. Cyprian, *Testimonia*, 3<sup>60</sup>, quotes them to prove that the Baptismal Creed is not to be divulged to unbelievers, Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, c. 18, in warning against baptising anyone without due preparation, and *De Praescr. Haer.* c. 41 in accusing the heretics of profaning Christian privileges in general.



it may be well here too to consider the latter first. As the two words occur in parallel clauses, it is probable that the reference of both is similar. Now whilst the swine is an unclean animal in the O.T., it was regarded in our Lord's days with an abhorrence which is not fully accounted for by the prohibition of eating swine's flesh. In all probability this was due to the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. He had commanded swine's flesh to be offered by the Jews in sacrifice, and had endeavoured to compel the faithful Israelites to eat it, and so to profane the Law (1 Macc. 1<sup>47</sup>, 2 Macc. 6<sup>18</sup>, 7<sup>1</sup>). After this it was stamped with the brand of abomination. According to Jewish tradition, the prohibition of the keeping even of swine, which was enforced with a curse, was connected with the Maccabean times.\* Sirach 22<sup>13</sup> offers a striking parallel to the use of the word 'swine' here, if we accept the Syriac reading 'pig,' which is favoured by the words in the following clause, 'when he shaketh himself.' In this passage 'pig' is parallel to 'a foolish man.' Pearls, on the other hand, as is implied in the Parable of the Pearl of great Price (Mt. 13<sup>45-46</sup>), were the most costly of valuables (*cf.* Rev. 21<sup>21</sup> and Pliny's 'Nat. Hist.' 9<sup>35</sup> 'Principium ergo culmenque omnium rerum pretii margaritae tenent'). Thus the idea conveyed by the casting of pearls before swine would be that of offering what was most valuable to those who were most degraded and unworthy. The saying reminds one of the comparison in Prov. 11<sup>22</sup>, 'As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so is a fair woman which is without discretion.'

The 'dogs' in the first member of the parallelism would probably be interpreted in the same sense as the 'swine' in the second, *i.e.* as referring to those persons who were utterly unworthy and unfitted to receive holy teaching. With this the connotation in the O.T. of the word 'dog' well agrees. To call a man a 'dog' is throughout the Bible a customary form of abuse. The pariah street dog which was so common in every Eastern city was to the Jews the type of all that is cowardly, lazy, filthy, treacherous, and generally contemptible. It was thus a fitting symbol of the man who had become morally and spiritually depraved, and

\* *Cf.* Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 260.

in one passage of the Pentateuch it is used of the male temple prostitute (Deut. 23<sup>18</sup>).

It is interesting in this connexion to notice that the LXX in 1 Kings 21<sup>19</sup> and 22<sup>38</sup> inserts αἱ ὄες in addition to οἱ κύνες of the Hebrew text, thus coupling dogs and swine together. In 2 Peter 2<sup>22</sup> also they are mentioned side by side.

It is true that the Jews spoke of the Gentiles as 'dogs'; e.g. the following saying of R. Elieser is quoted by Dean Savage, 'Whosoever eats with an idolater is the same as if he ate with a dog. For who is a dog? He who is not circumcised. So also is an idolater who is not circumcised.'<sup>a</sup> Some commentators therefore think that our Lord meant the heathen by the dogs and swine of the verse before us. In support of this view (1) the passage Mk. 7<sup>27-28</sup> = Mt. 15<sup>26-27</sup> is adduced. There our Lord says to the heathen Syro-phoenician, 'It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to the dogs.' It is natural to suppose that here the children refer to the Jews, and the dogs to the Gentiles, especially if this saying was preceded, as Matthew records, by the words 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' But it is not necessary so to interpret the words. The distinction which our Lord meant to convey by the words 'children' and 'dogs' may have been a moral rather than a racial or religious one. It is at least remarkable that He uses the diminutive κυνάριον in place of the usual κύων. And the woman, whether or not she knew of the Jewish use of the word to denote Gentiles such as herself, in her reply speaks of domestic puppies who live within the house. When the Jews likened the heathen to dogs, it was of course not of such that they thought, but of the scavenger dogs of the streets. But even if our Lord did use the word 'dogs' in a racial sense in testing the faith of a heathen woman, it by no means follows that He did so also in addressing a large and mixed multitude.

(2) Another passage which is quoted in support of a reference to Gentiles is the precept of the Mission Charge, 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep

<sup>a</sup> *Gospel of the Kingdom*, p. 223.

of the house of Israel' (Mt. 10<sup>5b-6</sup>). But the difference is so great between the general precepts of the Sermon and the particular injunctions of the Mission Charge that the precept in the latter bidding the disciples to confine their ministry to the Jews seems to have little weight as regards determining the interpretation of the precept of the Sermon.

It is clear that in the first century the term 'dogs' was figuratively used in an ethical as well as in a racial sense. In 2 Peter 2<sup>22</sup> it refers to Christians who lapse from the way of righteousness, and become entangled again in the defilements of the world; in Rev. 22<sup>15</sup> it seems to be used in a purely moral sense, and to be equivalent to the ἐβδελυγμένοι of Rev. 21<sup>8</sup>; whilst St. Paul in Phil. 3<sup>2</sup> actually retorts the term of reproach upon his Judaising opponents.<sup>a</sup>

Thus there seems good reason to think that our Lord used the words 'dogs' and 'swine' to signify, not Gentile race or non-Jewish faith, but moral uncleanness and unfitness. And it is not unlikely that the first hearers would so interpret His words. It was probably the Scribes and Pharisees who most commonly called the heathen as such 'dogs.' And in so doing they would probably think chiefly of the indiscriminate use by the heathen of meats, whether clean or not.<sup>b</sup> Apart from any special considerations it is difficult enough to believe that our Lord would designate the heathen in general by this opprobrious term. But it is the more difficult to think that in so doing He would adopt a term of contempt in vogue among the Pharisees, and particularly if it had special reference to that Jewish distinction between clean and unclean meats which He was about to abolish (cf. Mk. 7<sup>19b</sup>).

In the latter part of the saying some commentators have seen an example of the figure *chiasmus*. But it seems more natural to refer both καταπατήσωσιν and ῥήξωσιν to both dogs and swine without distinction. The former word would be understood to represent profanation and desecration, and the latter hostility on the part of the taught against their teacher. Such a warning would not apply to the uncircumcised in general, for we know that many of those

<sup>a</sup> At the present day the term is applied to Christians by Mohammedans.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Lightfoot on Phil. 3<sup>2</sup>.

who first heard the Apostolic preaching showed great appreciation and receptiveness of the Christian message. But it is universally true that, when men are in a certain moral and spiritual condition, they will act towards Christian teachers and their teaching in the way which our Lord describes.

We conclude, then, that what our Lord probably meant by this saying, and what the hearers probably understood Him to mean, was that sacred and precious teaching was not to be delivered to persons morally and spiritually unable to appreciate it, lest they should treat it in an irreverent and profane manner, and also be roused to hostility against those who had delivered it to them.

In the parabolic saying of the good and the bad tree, *σαπρός* seems to mean 'unsatisfactory, useless, worthless,' with no idea of decay or corruption, as in our modern slang word 'rotten.' It is in this sense that the word seems to be used also in Mt. 13<sup>48</sup> (of the worthless fish in the drag-net).

In Ps. 1<sup>3</sup> and Jerem. 17<sup>8</sup> the righteous man is likened to a flourishing and fruitful tree planted by the waters. If the First Psalm was in our Lord's mind in this closing portion of the Sermon it may have suggested to Him also the contrast between the good and the bad man, and the mention in the Psalm of the streams of water, the wind driving away the chaff, and the judgement, may have suggested to Him the closing illustration of the Sermon.

The passage from the Testament of Asher (1<sup>3-9</sup>) quoted on p. 166 is a striking parallel to our Lord's teaching about the heart and the life (*cf.* especially the expression *ὁ θησαυρὸς τοῦ διαβουλίου* in the Testament with *ὁ . . . θησαυρὸς τῆς καρδίας* in our Lord's words), and the Jews were probably acquainted with sayings similar to the others in this section of the Discourse.<sup>a</sup>

Taking them as they stand in our reconstructed Q text, the most natural thought connexion between them seems to be that in order to discriminate between those who are

<sup>a</sup> J. Lightfoot quotes a saying similar to 'the tree is known by its fruit' (*Hor. Hebr.* vol. ii. p. 159), and Edersheim refers to a parallel to 'Do men gather grapes of thorns?' (*Life and Times*, vol. i. p. 539).



worthy to receive Christian teaching and to appreciate it, and those who are not, the test of conduct must be applied. A good man can be distinguished from a bad man by his life, as a good tree from a worthless tree by its fruit. But it must remain doubtful whether this was the connexion between the sayings as the hearers received them, for there may have been much intervening matter.

5. THE DUTY OF DOING AS WELL AS HEARING.—The word *Kύριος* is used with different meanings in the Gospels. Delitzsch here translates it by אֲדֹנָי (Hebrew N.T.). This would be a divine title. In the light of the testimony of the Gospels as a whole it seems improbable that our Lord would be addressed by this title at this period of the Ministry, or that He would have claimed it for Himself. Generally as applied to Him in the Gospels *Κύριε* is a term of respectful address. In most of these cases it probably represents the customary title of courtesy מֶרִי, though in some cases it seems to stand for the more honourable title רַבִּי which disciples addressed to the teacher to whom they were attached. In all probability it is in the latter sense that the word is to be understood here. This title is appropriate to the period of the Ministry in which Christ appeared to men as a Prophet enunciating new teaching, and agrees well with the following words, 'And do not the things which I say.' The duplication of the words implies an impassioned address.

The parabolic illustration with which the Sermon closes is not unlike some passages in the Rabbinic literature. In Pirké Aboth 3<sup>22</sup> we read: 'He (R. Eleazar b. Azariah) used to say: Every one whose wisdom is greater than his deeds, to what is he like? To a tree whose branches are many and its roots few; and the wind comes and roots it up and turns it over on its face. [As it is said: "For he shall be like a tamarisk in the desert, and he shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, a salt land undwelt in."] But every one whose deeds are more than his wisdom, to what is he like? To a tree whose branches are few and its roots many, which, if all the winds that are in the world come and blow upon it, they move it not from its place; [as it is said: "For he shall

be as a tree planted by the waters, and that sendeth out its roots by the river, and shall not fear when heat cometh, but his leaf shall be green; and in the year of drought he shall not be anxious, neither shall cease from yielding fruit”].’ ‘A still more close parallel,’ says Edersheim,<sup>a</sup> ‘is that (Ab. de R. Nath. 24) in which the man who has good works, and learns much in the Law, is likened to one, who in building his house lays stones first, and on them bricks, so that when the flood cometh the house is not destroyed; while he who has not good works, yet busies himself much with the Law, is like one who puts bricks below, and stones above, which are swept away by the waters.’

The primary meaning of our Lord’s words seems to be clear. The hearers would probably understand that both builders desired to build their houses near a water-course, water in Palestine being precious. In the description of the storm our Lord may be thinking of one of the fierce wind storms to which Galilee is liable. As to whether He had in mind any particular storm which His followers would have to encounter, such as that of the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70, it is vain to conjecture. It is not improbable that He was thinking of the storm of persecution which was soon to break upon His Church. The hearers would no doubt understand His meaning to be that the man who hears and does not is as foolish, and will meet with as great disaster, as the man who builds his house upon the sand. And by ‘doing the things which I say’ our Lord will mean ‘living up to the teaching which I have delivered.’ Much of what is recorded of this teaching pertains to being rather than doing, and much consists of negative precepts.

<sup>a</sup> *Life and Times*, vol. i. p. 540.

## CHAPTER XII

## THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

OUR aim in this chapter is to estimate fairly the place which the Sermon holds in the teaching of Christ as a whole, and, as far as may be, to account for its characteristics from the historical position which it occupies in the Ministry.

I. THE LIMITATIONS OF THE SERMON.—First, the fact needs to be dwelt upon that the Sermon presents a very partial expression of the teaching of Christ. It is sometimes spoken of as if the substance of all His teaching, or at least of all His ethical teaching, was comprised within it. This is far from the truth. Even if we include the whole of the Matthaean and Lucan reports, many important elements of Christ's teaching find no place within its contents.

It may be useful to exhibit this in some detail. Here, then, are some of the more important omissions:

1. *Doctrinal.* There is no teaching on faith in Christ, and the power of such faith. There are no exhortations by our Lord to come to Him, no promises to those who come, and who confess Him before men, no warnings against denying Him before men, or being ashamed of Him and of His words, or of the consequences for the individual or the nation of rejecting Him. There are no predictions of the Passion and Resurrection. Consequently there is no teaching as to Christ's relation to the forgiveness of our sins. There is nothing as to the relation in which the Son stands to the Father. Nor is there any teaching on the power of corporate prayer, the Holy Spirit, the Church or the Sacraments.

2. *Eschatological.* There is no explicit announcement of Christ's second Coming (*cf.*, however, Mt. 7<sup>22</sup>), and

nothing as to the signs which are to precede it, or the duty of being watchful in view of its approach. The Sermon is silent as to a catastrophic coming of the Kingdom. Nor is there any mention of the coming tribulation of Jerusalem.

3. *Ethical.* There is no teaching on love to God (this duty is, however, implied in Mt. 6<sup>24</sup>), or on love to Christ; thus the highest motive for Christian conduct is not appealed to. There is nothing definite as to the value of active goodness, as distinct from passive endurance, for Christ's sake, or as to voluntary self-sacrifice for the sake of others. Sabbath observance and the traditions of the Jews are not touched upon.

In the shorter discourse of our reconstructed Q text there are numerous further omissions. These include the following:

1. *Doctrinal.* There is nothing as to faith in God, or the difficulty of entering into life, or as to any grace or present help from God.

2. *Eschatological.* There is no reference at all to Christ's second Coming, or to His office of Judge.

3. *Ethical.* There is no teaching on the duty of removing causes of stumbling, on the danger of covetousness or on not being anxious about temporal matters. There is nothing explicit as to the influence which the disciples are to exert upon the world, and no positive missionary teaching. Nor is there any teaching on fasting, divorce, the Scribes and Pharisees, or the permanence of the Law.

Moreover, some other elements in Christ's teaching which are not wholly absent are yet present merely by virtue of the slightest allusion: e.g. the only reference to prayer is in the precept 'Pray for them that persecute you'; repentance is enjoined only in 'Blessed are they that mourn'; and childlike humility only in the Beatitudes on the poor and the meek.

Looking now at the contents of the Sermon of Q in the light of these omissions, it is clear (1) that it is not a doctrinal discourse. The creed of the current orthodox Judaism is taken for granted, and the ethics are profoundly religious. The Sermon speaks of God's Kingdom and character, and of future rewards and punishments. Heaven is God's throne,



the earth is the footstool of His feet, and Jerusalem is His city. We feel that behind the teaching of the Sermon is Christ's consciousness of God's character. He is the Heavenly Father, who is kind even to the wicked. We are to aspire to be His sons by moral likeness to Him. But such doctrine as is implied is in the background. And all distinctively Christian doctrine is entirely absent. Our Lord speaks throughout as one conscious of possessing supreme authority. But He does not say that all authority has been given to Him in heaven and earth. There are no explicit declarations. He speaks as a Prophet. His quiet majestic tone of authority appears to be the natural and spontaneous expression of His inner consciousness. The divinity of the Speaker is behind all the teaching, but it is no part of the direct message of the Sermon. So with the doctrine of grace. The hearers no doubt believed in supernatural help vouchsafed by God to those who trusted in Him and prayed to Him, and lived in humble dependence upon Him. And the idea of blessedness in the Beatitudes may imply grace ; as possibly also the digging down to the rock in the illustration of the builders. But there is nothing expressed about grace. Although the precepts touch, not outward conduct only, but also the inmost springs of action within the heart, they yet are addressed to the will from without. The whole Discourse moves in the realm of law and requirement.\*

(2) Again, it is clear that the Sermon is not an eschatological discourse. The eschatological element is not entirely absent, indeed, but it is in the background. It is on ethics, not on eschatology, that the stress is laid. There is not a single saying in our Q text which is predominantly eschatological, and most of the sayings have not even an eschatological flavour or colouring. This is noteworthy in view of the contention of some scholars that the main message of our Lord was an eschatological one. On this subject we shall have more to say in the next chapter.

(3) Thirdly, the contents of the Sermon are pre-eminently ethical in character. From beginning to end the message is addressed to the conscience. Its implications

\* Cf. Strong, *Christian Ethics*, pp. 20-22.

indeed extend outside the sphere of ethics, but the central import of all the sayings is ethical. Yet even on the ethical side it by no means covers the whole field of Christ's teaching. It is the manward side of duty, rather than the specifically Godward, of which it treats; and even on the manward side it is far from including all Christ's teaching.

II. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SERMON.—But, secondly, though but a very partial and incomplete presentation of Christ's teaching, it is a very important and prominent part of that teaching which the Sermon contains. Evidence of this is afforded by the number of the parallels to the Sermon sayings which occur, both in the rest of Christ's teaching and in the Apostolical writers. We will endeavour to enumerate the more striking of each of these. We shall follow the text of the Revised Version.

(1) First, then, the parallels in the rest of Christ's teaching. We will take the Sermon sayings in order.

*Blessed are the poor* : cf. Lk. 4<sup>18</sup> (from Is. 61<sup>1</sup>, the Lord anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor, etc.).

Mk. 8<sup>34-35</sup> = Mt. 16<sup>24-25</sup> = Lk. 9<sup>23-24</sup> : cf. Mt. 10<sup>37-39</sup> = Lk. 14<sup>26-27</sup>, 17<sup>33</sup> (discipleship entails cross-bearing, and losing one's life for Christ's sake).

Mk. 13<sup>9-13</sup> = Mt. 24<sup>9, 13</sup>, 10<sup>16-23</sup> = Lk. 21<sup>12-19</sup> (the persecutions in store for the disciples).

Mt. 10<sup>24-33</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>2-9</sup> (fear not men but fear God).

*Blessed are the meek* : cf. same passages as above, and Mk. 9<sup>33-37</sup> = Mt. 18<sup>1-5</sup> = Lk. 9<sup>46-48</sup>, cf. Mt. 23<sup>11</sup> (the need of childlike humility).

Mk. 10<sup>13-16</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>13-15</sup> = Lk. 18<sup>15-17</sup> (only by receiving the kingdom as a little child is entrance possible).

Mk. 10<sup>42-45</sup> = Mt. 20<sup>25-28</sup> = Lk. 22<sup>24-27</sup> (whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister).

Mt. 21<sup>5</sup> (behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and riding upon an ass).

Mt. 23<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 14<sup>11</sup>, 18<sup>14</sup> (whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled).

Jn. 13<sup>12-15</sup> (if I have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet).

*Blessed are they that hunger and thirst* : cf. Mt. 6<sup>33</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>31</sup> (seek ye first his kingdom).

## 210 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

Mt. 13<sup>44-46</sup> (the hidden treasure and the pearl of great price).

*Blessed are they that mourn and weep:* cf. Mk. 1<sup>15</sup> = Mt. 4<sup>17</sup> (repent, for the kingdom is at hand).

Mk. 2<sup>17</sup> = Mt. 9<sup>12-13</sup> = Lk. 5<sup>31-32</sup> (I came not to call the righteous but sinners).

Lk. 13<sup>3-5</sup> (except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish).

Lk. 15<sup>3-32</sup>, cf. Mt. 18<sup>12-14</sup> (the lost sheep, lost coin and lost son).

Lk. 18<sup>9-14</sup> (the Pharisee and the publican).

*Blessed are the merciful:* cf. Lk. 10<sup>25-37</sup> (the good Samaritan).

*Blessed are the pure in heart:* cf. Mt. 6<sup>19-21</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>33-34</sup> (lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven).

Mt. 6<sup>22-23</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>34-36</sup> (the single and the evil eye).

Mt. 6<sup>24</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>13</sup> (no man can serve two masters).

Mt. 23<sup>26</sup> (cleanse first the inside of the cup), cf. Lk. 11<sup>41</sup> (give for alms those things which are within).

Lk. 8<sup>15</sup> (that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart).

*Blessed are the peacemakers:* cf. Mt. 5<sup>23-26</sup> (if thou art offering thy gift at the altar).

Mk. 9<sup>50</sup> (be at peace one with another).

*Blessed are they that have been persecuted.* *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, etc.:* cf. the passages quoted under *Blessed are the poor*, and Mt. 11<sup>28-30</sup> (take my yoke upon you).

Jn. 15<sup>18-21</sup> (because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you).

*Woe unto the rich:* cf. the passages quoted above under *Blessed are the poor* and Mk. 10<sup>23-25</sup> = Mt. 19<sup>23-24</sup> = Lk. 18<sup>24-25</sup> (how hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God).

Mk. 4<sup>19</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>22</sup> = Lk. 8<sup>14</sup> (the cares of the world and the deceitfulness of riches).

*Woe unto the full, those that laugh:* cf. the passages quoted above under *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst* and *that mourn and weep*.

*Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you : cf. the passages quoted above under Blessed are they that have been persecuted, etc., and Blessed are the poor.*

*Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets : cf. Mt. 5<sup>18</sup> = Lk. 16<sup>17</sup> (till heaven and earth pass away, not one tittle of the law shall fall).*

*Jn. 1<sup>17</sup> (the law was given by Moses ; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ).*

*Jn. 10<sup>35</sup> (the scripture cannot be broken).*

*The First Illustration. Whosoever shall say to his brother, etc. : cf. Mt. 12<sup>36</sup> (account shall be given of every idle word). Mt. 12<sup>37</sup> (by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned).*

*The Fourth Illustration. As ye would that men should do to you, etc. : cf. Mk. 12<sup>31</sup> = Mt. 22<sup>39</sup>, cf. Lk. 10<sup>27</sup> (thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself).*

*The Fifth Illustration. If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye, etc. : cf. Lk. 6<sup>34-35a</sup> (even sinners lend to sinners, to receive again as much).*

*Judge not . . . with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you ; cf. Mk. 11<sup>25</sup>, Mt. 6<sup>14-15</sup> (our forgiveness by God dependent on our forgivingness towards others).*

*Mt. 6<sup>12</sup> = Lk. 11<sup>4</sup> (forgive us our debts, etc.)*

*Mt. 18<sup>21-22</sup>, cf. Lk. 17<sup>3-4</sup> (the duty of forgiveness towards an offending brother).*

*Mt. 18<sup>23-35</sup> (the unmerciful servant).*

*Can the blind guide the blind, etc. : cf. Mt. 23<sup>16, 17, 19, 24</sup> (ye blind guides).*

*The disciple is not above his master, etc. : cf. Jn. 13<sup>16</sup>, 15<sup>20</sup> (a servant is not greater than his lord).*

*Why beholdest thou the mote, etc. : cf. Lk. 18<sup>9-14</sup> (the Pharisee and the publican).*

*The tree known by its fruit : cf. Mt. 7<sup>17, 19, 20</sup>.*

*The good man bringing forth good out of the good treasure of his heart : cf. Lk. 8<sup>15</sup> (that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart bring forth fruit with patience).*

*The evil man out of the evil treasure bringing forth evil : cf. Mt. 12<sup>34</sup> (how can ye, being evil, speak good things ?).*



*Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, etc. : cf. Mt. 5<sup>19</sup> (whosoever shall break one of these least commandments).*

Mt. 7<sup>22, 23</sup> (many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, etc.).

Mk. 3<sup>33-35</sup> = Mt. 12<sup>48-50</sup> = Lk. 8<sup>21</sup> (whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother).

Jn. 13<sup>17</sup> (if ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them).

Jn. 15<sup>8</sup> (herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit); 15<sup>14</sup> (ye are my friends if ye do the things which I command you); 15<sup>16</sup> (I chose you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide).

*Every one that cometh unto me and heareth these words of mine, etc. : cf. Mk. 4<sup>1-9, 13-20</sup> = Mt. 13<sup>1-9, 18-23</sup> = Lk. 8<sup>4-8, 11-15</sup> (parable of the sower); Lk. 13<sup>6-9</sup> (barren fig tree, cf. Mk. 11<sup>12-14, 20</sup> = Mt. 21<sup>18-19</sup>).*

Mt. 25<sup>14-30</sup>, Lk. 19<sup>14-27</sup> (the talents and the pounds).

Thus to much of the Sermon there is matter of more or less similar purport in the rest of Christ's recorded teaching. This fact indicates that many at least of the ideas enunciated in the Sermon were leading and fundamental in our Lord's mind, and found expression in differing forms on various occasions. The Sermon is one with the rest of Christ's teaching inasmuch as, in both, the ' Gospel of the Kingdom ' is the fundamental theme.

Looking at the distribution of the parallels we have quoted, it is clear that they are comparatively numerous to the Beatitudes, and comparatively few to the illustrations of the fulfilment of the Law. There is no Beatitude without parallels, but we have not found any to the second and third illustrations close enough to call for inclusion in our list. This is also the case with the precept against giving that which is holy to the dogs. The other illustrations of the fulfilment of the law, especially the fourth and fifth, are all but unique in the teaching of Christ.

(2) Secondly, the parallels outside the teaching of Christ.

*Acts of the Apostles : cf. 7<sup>51-52</sup> (ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised . . . which of the prophets did not your*

fathers persecute, etc.) with 'for in like manner did their fathers to the prophets.'

14<sup>22</sup> (through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted,' etc.

15<sup>20, 29</sup>, Western text (and whatsoever things they would not be done to them, not to do to others), with the Golden Rule.

1 *Thess.*: cf. 2<sup>14-15</sup> (ye . . . became imitators of the churches of God which are in Judaea . . . for ye also suffered the same things of your countrymen, even as they did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, etc.) with 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you,' etc.

3<sup>3-4</sup> (that no man be moved by these afflictions; for yourselves know that hereunto we are appointed, etc.) with the same passage.

5<sup>13</sup> (be at peace among yourselves) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

5<sup>14</sup> (encourage the fainthearted, support the weak, be longsuffering toward all) with 'Blessed are the poor.'

5<sup>15</sup> (see that none render unto any one evil for evil; but alway follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all) with 'Resist not him that is evil,' etc.

2 *Thess.*: cf. 1<sup>4-7</sup> (we . . . glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgement of God; to the end that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, etc.) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted,' etc.

*Gal.*: cf. 5<sup>22-23</sup> (the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers, the poor, the merciful, the pure in heart, the meek.'

6<sup>1</sup> (even if a man be overtaken in any trespass . . . restore such a one in a spirit of meekness; looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted) with 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc., and 'Blessed are the meek.'

6<sup>2</sup> (bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ) with the Golden Rule.

1 *Cor.*: cf. 4<sup>5</sup> (judge nothing before the time, etc.) with 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc.

4<sup>12-13</sup> (being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we endure; being defamed, we intreat) with 'Love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you.'

6<sup>7-8</sup> (why not rather take wrong? why not rather be defrauded? etc.) with 'Resist not him that is evil,' etc.

13<sup>4</sup> (love suffereth long) with 'Blessed are the poor.'

2 *Cor.*: cf. 4<sup>17-18</sup> (our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory, etc.) with 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you,' etc.

5<sup>2-5</sup> (we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, etc.) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted.'

6<sup>4-6</sup> (in everything commending ourselves, as ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings; in pureness, in knowledge, in longsuffering, in kindness, in the Holy Ghost, in love unfeigned) with 'Blessed are the poor, the meek, the pure in heart, they that have been persecuted.'

13<sup>11</sup> (be of the same mind; live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

*Rom.*: cf. 2<sup>19</sup> ff. (and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind . . . thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself, etc.) with 'Can the blind guide the blind,' etc.

5<sup>3</sup> ff. (let us also rejoice in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation worketh patience, etc.) with 'Rejoice in that day, and be exceeding glad,' etc.

12<sup>13</sup> (communicating to the necessities of the saints; given to hospitality) with 'Give to him that asketh thee.'

12<sup>14</sup> (bless them that persecute you; bless, and curse not) with 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you.'

12<sup>17, 19-21</sup> (render to no man evil for evil. . . . avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto wrath . . . but

if thine enemy hunger, feed him, etc.) with 'Resist not him that is evil. . . . Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you.'

12<sup>18</sup> (if it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

14<sup>1-13</sup> (who art thou that judgest the servant of another . . . let us not therefore judge one another any more) with 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc.

14<sup>17</sup> (the kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst, the peacemakers.'

14<sup>19</sup> (so then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers, they that hunger and thirst.'

*Col.*: cf. 1<sup>11</sup> (strengthened with all power . . . unto all patience and long-suffering with joy) with 'Blessed are the poor.'

2<sup>16-17</sup> (let no man . . . judge you in meat, or in drink . . . which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's) with 'I came not to destroy but to fulfil.'

3<sup>8</sup> (put ye also away all these; anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth) with 'every one who is angry with his brother . . . and whosoever shall say to his brother,' etc.

3<sup>12-13</sup> (put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any) with 'Blessed are the merciful, the meek, the poor; release, and ye shall be released.'

*Ephes.*: cf. 4<sup>2</sup> (walk with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love) with 'Blessed are the meek, the poor.'

4<sup>3</sup> (giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

4<sup>31-32</sup> (let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each



other) with 'every one who is angry with his brother . . . and whosoever shall say to his brother, etc. Blessed are the merciful; release and ye shall be released.'

5<sup>1</sup> (be ye . . . imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love) with 'Be ye merciful, as your heavenly Father is merciful.'

*Philipp.*: cf. 1<sup>27-29</sup> (that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel; and in nothing affrighted by the adversaries: which is for them an evident token of perdition, but of your salvation, and that from God; because to you it hath been granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf: having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me) with 'Blessed are the poor, they that have been persecuted, etc. Woe unto the rich, Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you,' etc.

2<sup>3</sup> (in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

3<sup>10-11</sup> (that I may know . . . the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead) with 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you,' etc.

4<sup>8</sup> (whatsoever things are true . . . honourable . . . just . . . pure . . . lovely . . . of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things) with 'Blessed are the pure in heart.'

1 *Tim.*: cf. 2<sup>8</sup> (I desire . . . that the men pray . . . without wrath and disputing) with 'Every one who is angry,' etc.

2<sup>10</sup>, 6<sup>18-19</sup> (that women adorn themselves through good works; that the rich do good . . . be rich in good works . . . be ready to distribute, willing to communicate, etc.) with 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord,' etc., and the Parable of the two Builders.

3<sup>3</sup> (no brawler, no striker; but gentle, not contentious) with 'Blessed are the meek, the peacemakers.'

6<sup>11</sup> (follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst, the meek.'

*Titus*: cf. 1<sup>15-16</sup> (to the pure all things are pure: but to

them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure, etc.) with 'Blessed are the pure in heart.'

2<sup>14</sup>, 3<sup>1, 8, 14</sup> (who gave himself for us, that he might . . . purify unto himself a people . . . zealous of good works. Put them in mind to be . . . ready unto every good work. Concerning these things, I will that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they which have believed God may be careful to maintain good works. And let our people also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful) with 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord,' etc., and the Parable of the two Builders.

3<sup>2</sup> (not to be contentious, to be gentle, shewing all meekness toward all men) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

2 *Tim.*: cf. 2<sup>22</sup> (follow after righteousness, faith, love, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst, the peacemakers, the pure in heart.'

2<sup>24-25</sup> (the Lord's servant must . . . be gentle towards all, . . . forbearing, in meekness correcting them that oppose themselves) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

3<sup>10-12</sup> (thou didst follow my . . . longsuffering, . . . patience, persecutions, sufferings, . . . Yea, and all that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution) with 'Blessed are the poor, the meek, they that have been persecuted.'

*Heb.*: cf. 12<sup>14</sup> (follow after peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers, the pure in heart.'

13<sup>21</sup> (the God of peace make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ) with 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?'

*James*: cf. 1<sup>2-4</sup> (count it all joy . . . when ye fall into manifold temptations (πειρασμοῖς); knowing that the proof of your faith worketh patience, etc.) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted,' etc.

1<sup>9-11</sup> (let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away, etc.) with 'Blessed are the poor, Woe to the rich.'

## 218 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

1<sup>19-20</sup> (let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath: for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God) with 'Every one who is angry with his brother,' etc.

1<sup>21</sup> (receive with meekness the implanted word) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

1<sup>22-25</sup> (be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves. For if any one is a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror . . . But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing) with 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord,' etc., and the Parable of the two Builders.

2<sup>5</sup> (did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him?) with 'Blessed are the poor: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.'

2<sup>8</sup> (if ye fulfil the royal law, according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well) with the Golden Rule.

2<sup>13</sup> (judgement is without mercy to him that hath shewed no mercy: mercy glorieth against judgement) with 'Blessed are the merciful,' etc. 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc.

2<sup>14-26</sup> (what doth it profit . . . if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? . . . Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will shew thee my faith. . . . As the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead) with 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord,' etc.; 'the tree is known by its fruit,' etc., and the Parable of the two Builders.

3<sup>11-1</sup> (doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter? can a fig tree . . . yield olives, or a vine figs? neither can salt water yield sweet. Who is wise and understanding among you? let him shew by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter jealousy and faction in your heart, glory not and lie not against the truth) with 'Do men

gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? The good man, out of the good treasure of his heart,' etc.

3<sup>17</sup> (the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without variance, without hypocrisy) with 'Blessed are the pure in heart, the peacemakers, the meek, the merciful; the tree is known by its fruit.'

4<sup>6, 10</sup> (the scripture saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble. . . . Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

4<sup>8</sup> (draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners: and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst, Blessed are the pure in heart.'

4<sup>9</sup> (be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness) with 'Blessed are they that mourn and weep.'

4<sup>11-12</sup> (speak not one against another, brethren . . . who art thou that judgest thy neighbour?) with 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc.

5<sup>1 ff.</sup> (go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you. . . . Ye have lived delicately on the earth, and taken your pleasure, etc.) with 'Woe unto the rich, for they have received their consolation; Woe unto those that are full, for they shall hunger and thirst.'

5<sup>7, 8, 11</sup> (be patient . . . until the coming of the Lord. . . . Behold, we call them blessed which endured: ye have heard of the patience of Job, etc.) with 'Blessed are the poor, they that have been persecuted.'

5<sup>9</sup> (murmur not, brethren, one against another, that ye be not judged) with 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged,' etc.

5<sup>10</sup> (take . . . for an example of suffering and of patience, the prophets who spoke in the name of the Lord) with 'for in the same manner did their fathers to the prophets.'

5<sup>12</sup> (above all things . . . swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath: but let



your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgement) with 'swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet; nor by Jerusalem . . . neither shalt thou swear by thy head . . . but let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.'

1 *Peter*: cf. 1<sup>6-7</sup> (wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a little while, if need be, ye have been put to grief in manifold temptations, etc.) with 'Blessed are ye when men shall hate you,' etc.

1<sup>15-16</sup> (like as he which called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living, etc.) with 'that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven'; 'be ye merciful, as your heavenly Father is merciful.'

2<sup>2</sup> (as newborn babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst.'

2<sup>18-20</sup>, 3<sup>14, 17</sup>, 4<sup>12-16, 19</sup> (this is acceptable, if for conscience toward God a man endureth griefs, suffering wrongfully, etc. But and if ye should suffer for righteousness' sake, blessed are ye, etc. Think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which cometh upon you to prove you. . . . If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye . . . if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name. Wherefore let them also that suffer according to the will of God commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted,' etc.

3<sup>4</sup> (but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

3<sup>8</sup> (be ye all likeminded, compassionate, loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humbleminded) with 'Blessed are the merciful, the meek.'

3<sup>9</sup> (not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling; but contrariwise blessing) with 'Resist not him that is evil,' etc.

3<sup>11</sup> (from Ps. 34: He that would love life, . . . Let

him seek peace, and pursue it) with 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

3<sup>15</sup>, 5<sup>5-6</sup> (being ready always to give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, yet with meekness and fear; all of you gird yourselves with humility . . . for God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time) with 'Blessed are the meek.'

1 *John*: cf. 3<sup>15</sup> (whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer) with 'every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement,' etc.

*Revel.*: cf. 2<sup>9-11</sup>, 3<sup>19</sup> (fear not the things which thou art about to suffer: . . . Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life, etc. As many as I love, I reprove and chasten) with 'Blessed are they that have been persecuted,' etc. 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you,' etc.

3<sup>1-3</sup> (I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead . . . for I have found no works of thine fulfilled before my God) with 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord,' etc.

21<sup>6</sup>, 22<sup>17</sup> (I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely) with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst.'

Thus it is evident that the affinities to the Sermon sayings in the N.T. writers are numerous. We cannot indeed be sure that in every case the similarity to the teaching of Christ is due to dependence upon it. Especially in view of the numerous Jewish parallels to Christ's sayings, the possibility of coincidences of thought without dependence is always present. This possibility is less remote in some passages and in some writings than in others (*e.g.* according to the measure of Jewish education which the writers had received). There is also the possibility that in some degree the record of Christ's sayings may have been influenced by the writings of the Apostles. But, on the whole, the sayings attributed to our Lord bear the mark of

superior originality; and, in view of the impression which His teaching and Person had made upon the Apostles, and upon all His followers, it seems reasonable to infer dependence from similarity of teaching.

Looking at the distribution of the parallels, we see that we have included parallels from all the books of the N.T. outside the Gospels except Philemon, 2 Peter and Jude, and 2 and 3 John. They are most numerous and most verbally akin in the Epistle of James, but substantial also in several other Epistles, especially Romans and 1 Peter.

We have included in our list parallels to all the Sermon sayings except the following:—the revision of the law of adultery; and the sayings ‘If ye love them that love you,’ etc. (in the fifth illustration); ‘The disciple is not above his master,’ etc.; ‘Why beholdest thou the mote,’ etc.; and ‘Give not that which is holy to the dogs,’ etc. The portions of the Sermon which have the most numerous parallels are the Beatitudes, especially those pronounced upon the poor, the meek, and the persecuted; the revision of the law of murder, and of the laws of retaliation, and of love and hatred; the prohibitions of judging others; and the enforcement of the need of doing good works (especially in the Pastorals and in the Epistle of James). It is interesting to note that, broadly speaking, the extent of the parallelism in the Apostolic writers to the several sayings of the Sermon corresponds with that which we noted in the rest of Christ’s own teaching. It is reasonable therefore to think that in part the greater prominence of some of the Sermon sayings in the apostolic writers as compared with others is due to their greater prominence in the teaching of Christ Himself. But the former may well be also due in part to the circumstances and needs of the early Christian communities. And it is possible that these circumstances and needs may have influenced the relative prominence of different aspects of Christ’s teaching in the Gospel records.

It is remarkable in how many passages, where a string of moral qualities is enjoined, several of the Beatitudes are echoed together. Specially notable are the parallels to the revision of the laws of retaliation and of love and hatred in Rom. 12<sup>14-21</sup>, and to the revision of the law of oaths in Jas. 5<sup>12</sup>.

## III. THE PLACE OF THE SERMON IN CHRIST'S TEACHING.

—We now turn from statistics, and consider from the historical standpoint the true place and weight of the Sermon in our Lord's teaching.

On the one hand, there are the limitations of the Sermon. As we have seen, many very important elements in Christ's teaching find no place within it. Compared with some of Christ's later teaching that of the Sermon may be described as elementary.

Now these limitations are attributable to the place of the Sermon in the Ministry. It is essentially the representative of the earlier teaching of Christ, and it bears the marks of its early date. No doubt, if a *verbatim* report had been preserved to us, the number of its omissions would be less than it actually is; but many would probably remain, especially in regard to doctrine and eschatology, and its predominantly ethical character would be confirmed. For the Gospels give evidence that, as time passed and circumstances changed, our Lord's teaching also changed. They indicate, *e.g.*, the points in the Ministry at which He adopted the parabolic method of instruction, and later began to announce His Passion and Resurrection. Thus we do not expect to find parables in the strict sense of the word in the pre-parabolic period of the Ministry, or explicit predictions of the Passion and Resurrection prior to Peter's great Confession.

On the other hand, there is the greatness and importance of the Sermon. As we have seen, there are many parallels in the other recorded words of Christ, and in the writings of the Apostles, to much of its contents. These parallels show the importance of the Sermon sayings to which they are akin, as being prominent ideas in Christ's mind. But the sayings of the Sermon which are not so paralleled are also of great value on this very account. The ideas which these express may also have been prominent ideas in the mind of Christ. It would be unjustifiable, in view of the fragmentary nature of our records, to infer from the lack of parallels that they dropped out of our Lord's teaching as time went on. Whilst the abundance of parallels indicates prominence, their paucity or absence is no proof of the contrary. All the leading thoughts of the Sermon may well



have continued to be leading thoughts to the end of the Ministry. But of some of them the Sermon happens to be the sole expression, and on this account it is of great importance. And even in the case of those ideas which do more or less reappear elsewhere, the particular expression of them which is given in the Sermon sayings is of real value.

So far as mere length and fullness are gauges of importance, they exalt the Sermon very high; for our records point to its having been, if not the longest and most elaborate, at least one of the longest discourses ever delivered by our Lord upon a single occasion.

But the Sermon is not simply a great discourse. It is a great discourse assigned to a definite historical occasion, and that one of the greatest in the whole course of the Ministry. This fact gives to it an historical interest and importance which much of the discourse matter in Lk. 9<sup>51</sup>–18<sup>14</sup> lacks, great and important as that is.

Further, the Sermon holds a unique position as being the first considerable discourse of Christ of which the record has been preserved in our Gospels. Prior to the Call of the Twelve there is none of any length in the Synoptic Gospels, and none approaching it in extent in the Fourth Gospel's record of the same period.

Once more, there is much ground for thinking that, on the whole at least, the Sermon fairly represents the teaching which our Lord was wont to deliver during the previous period of His Ministry. For, (1) it is not occasional in the sense in which much else in the recorded teaching of Christ is so, *i.e.* as arising out of particular controversies or situations, and dealing with specific points, *e.g.* the Sabbath sayings, the Beelzebub Discourse, the Discourse in Mk. 7 on the traditions of the elders, etc. Comparatively speaking, the Sermon teaching is very general.

(2) On the other hand, it was delivered on a very important occasion. But the occasion was not such as to limit and confine the teaching, or to direct it to insistence on particular points. The Sermon is as general as the subsequent Mission Charges to the Twelve and the Seventy are particular. Whilst the latter are addressed to the dis-

ciples alone, and instruct them as to their relations with the people into whose midst they are about to go, the former is (as we have in a previous chapter seen reason to conclude) delivered not only to the Twelve but also to the whole body of the disciples, and in the hearing of a crowd of people. In the one case we have detailed instructions delivered to clergy alone in view of a particular mission, in the other a Sermon addressed to newly-ordained men in the presence of their relatives and friends and of a large congregation.

The Ordination sermon as we know it to-day is fittingly general in character, and naturally summarises the great truths and aims which the ministers of Christ ought ever to have before their mind's eye. So our Lord may well have been led in the Sermon on the Mount to express in general terms the substance of His whole message hitherto.

(3) Some support to this view is given by the fact that the Sermon in the synagogue of Nazareth (Lk. 4<sup>16</sup> ff.), the only earlier recorded discourse, is quite in line with the thought of the Sermon on the Mount. As we noticed in the previous chapter, there is reason to think that in the opening Beatitudes of the Sermon the first verses of Isaiah 61 were specially present to our Lord's mind. And the conviction that hatred and persecution are inevitable for His true followers, which is so prominent in the Sermon on the Mount, is already expressed in the Sermon at Nazareth in the words, 'No prophet is acceptable in his own country' (Lk. 4<sup>24</sup>).

If for these reasons we may fairly trust the Sermon of Q as giving a substantially correct record of the substance of Christ's teaching during the whole previous period of the Ministry, from the time when He began to preach, 'Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' then an added historical interest attaches to its contents.

In spite of all its limitations, then, we view the Sermon on the Mount as a document of the highest importance, and hold that our Gospels would be immeasurably the poorer if the fifty-four verses of our Q text were to be deleted from them.

IV. POSSIBLE INFLUENCES UPON OUR LORD'S MIND.—  
Can the contents of the Sermon be accounted for in any

degree by particular formative influences upon the mind of Christ, or by any controlling aims and ideas? The parallels from the Jewish sacred literature which we have quoted in Chapter X show that the Sermon has special affinities with particular books and passages. We shall have occasion, in the next chapter, to consider these parallels and the inferences which may be drawn from them. Leaving then this question aside for the present, we ask, Are there any influences besides this which may be postulated with a certain degree of probability?

(1) The thought of the Kingdom is prominent in the opening verses of the Sermon. The Beatitudes give a sublime delineation of its spiritual character. It seems probable therefore that our Lord gave utterance to the Beatitudes at least, and perhaps also to other sayings in the Sermon, under the stress of a desire to correct the current national and political ideas of the Kingdom. In a full expression of our Lord's mind each pronouncement of the Beatitudes would then be contrasted with a current conception as to the Kingdom, after the manner of the contrasts drawn in the illustrations which follow.

(2) The thought of Himself as the new Lawgiver, the fulfiller of the Mosaic Law, was clearly present to our Lord's mind, and there is much in the content and the character of the Discourse which may be attributable to the influence of this thought. Our first Evangelist, if not our Third also, seems to have regarded the Sermon as an enunciation of the Christian Law, and the Beatitudes as answering to the Decalogue. Of no other discourse of Christ is it recorded that it was delivered upon a mountain; its contents are exclusively concerned with the moral law, and outside it the only expressed contrast between the old laws and the new teaching is that which Matthew incorporates in his version, viz. the revision of the law of divorce.

(3) It is possible also that much which characterises the Sermon is attributable to the opposition to our Lord of the Scribes and Pharisees. As we have seen, that opposition had been growing in force and bitterness for some time prior to the delivery of the Sermon. The Choice of the Twelve followed upon its culmination in the plot of the Pharisees and Herodians recorded in Mk. 3<sup>6</sup>. It would be natural

*a priori* therefore to suppose that a good deal in the Sermon would bear traces of this opposition. And an examination of it in this light lends credibility to the supposition that such is in fact the case. Although all mention of the Scribes and Pharisees has dropped out of our Q text, much of the Sermon contents can nevertheless, as we have partly noted in a previous chapter, be naturally supposed to have been called forth to warn against or to correct Pharisaic errors. It may be that the pre-eminently ethical character of the whole teaching of the Sermon is also in part due to the pressure of Pharisaic animosity. For it was on points of duty and practice, the ethics of the Pharisaic Code, that the controversy turned, and not on matters of theology or of eschatology.

(4) There is considerable affinity between the Beatitudes and Woes and the Magnificat; *cf.* 'And hath exalted them of low degree' with 'Blessed are the meek,' etc., 'the poor,' etc.; 'The hungry he hath filled with good things' with 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst,' etc.; 'He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart . . . And the rich he hath sent empty away' with 'Woe unto the rich,' etc., and the other Woes. This affinity suggests the influence upon our Lord's mind of the Virgin's piety. It is difficult to suppose that such a mother can have failed profoundly to influence the deepest thoughts of such a Son during the long years of their intimate home life. Far more of the Sermon than we commonly think may derive from the devout mind of Mary herself. The pious souls among her kindred and friends, too, may have exerted a similar influence upon our Lord's growing religious nature. We are here, however, trespassing into the region of conjecture. What is certain is that the Magnificat is an admirable expression of that type of Jewish piety which is so highly extolled in the Beatitudes. It is a reasonable supposition that our Lord had come strongly under the influence of this type. Whether this influence was exerted upon Him mainly through Mary herself, or through others, or whether He was mainly influenced by the literature of His race in which that spirit found expression—*e.g.* the Song of Hannah, with which the Magnificat presents so many points of contact; the Psalms; and Second Isaiah—must remain uncertain.



(5) Once again, it seems probable that our Lord was in some measure influenced by the personality and the preaching of His great forerunner. Elizabeth was a kinswoman of the Virgin (Lk. 1<sup>36</sup>), and the Birth of Jesus occurred within a few months of that of John. There may have been companionship between the two before John began his ministry. The words of Jn. 1<sup>31</sup> 'And I knew Him not' may not imply more than that the Baptist did not know Jesus to be the Messiah. In any case, our Lord came into close contact with the Baptist during the latter's ministry. Several of His disciples had previously been attached to him, and for a time Jesus and John exercised their ministries in close proximity to each other (Jn. 3<sup>22</sup> ff.). Our Gospels record the remarkable testimony of our Lord to the greatness of the Baptist (Mt. 11<sup>2-15</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>18-28</sup>), and probably a considerable number among those who heard the Sermon had either been attached to him, or at least been in some degree influenced by his life and message.

Moreover, in spite of great and obvious differences, there was a certain continuity between the forerunner's ministry and message, and those of his successor. The announcement with which our Lord is recorded to have begun His Galilaean Ministry was similar to that of the Baptist (*cf.* Mk. 1<sup>4, 15</sup>), and even, according to Matthew, couched in identical words (*cf.* Mt. 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>17</sup>). And there are affinities between the Sermon and the records of the Baptist's preaching. Both are taken up with duty and requirement, both sound the note of repentance, and both lay stress on the necessity of good works. Both use the imagery of the tree and its fruit; the Baptist speaks of the ceding of the coat (χιτών), our Lord of the ceding of the cloke (ἱμάτιον); and with the Baptist's precept, 'He that hath food, let him do likewise' (Lk. 3<sup>11</sup>), may be compared our Lord's words, 'Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.' The Baptist speaks of the wrath to come, the fire which only those who bear good fruit in their lives shall escape; our Lord closes His Discourse with the illustration of the Two Builders, in which the tempest overthrows the house built upon the sand by the man who hears and does not.

## CHAPTER XIII

THE VALUE AND IMPORT OF THE TEACHING OF THE  
SERMON

IN this, our last chapter, we shall first endeavour to give some answer to the question, 'What value is to be set upon the teaching of the Sermon?' Then, we shall seek to draw out the implications and deeper import of its contents. Finally, we shall briefly consider its message to our own age.

I. THE VALUE OF THE SERMON TEACHING.—As we have seen in Chapter X, the teaching of the Sermon is closely related to much that is found in the pre-Christian Jewish literature. It will be convenient to begin our consideration of the value of our Lord's words by making certain inferences from the parallels we have adduced. A careful comparison of the Sermon sayings with these passages reveals much that is of interest and importance.

On the one hand, it shows quite clearly that much of the contents of the Sermon is not original in substance and purport. It is a reiteration of what had been said before. Some of the parallels are seen to be so remarkably close as to suggest literary dependence. Of course, parallelism does not necessarily imply dependence. Yet, as regards the canonical books, this is a very reasonable explanation of at least much of the parallelism. For the Gospels yield abundant evidence that our Lord was well acquainted with the Scriptures. And it is possible, if not also probable, that He may also have been acquainted, in whole or in part, with those other Jewish books with which His words show affinity.

On the other hand, comparison also shows that the Sermon is not devoid of originality. To some passages

the parallels are much fuller and closer than they are to others. And there are elements in the Sermon teaching to which no parallels are to be found.

Looking now more closely at the parallelism, the extent of the affinities of the Sermon on the one hand, and of its originality on the other, may be briefly stated as follows :—in the Beatitudes, taken singly, we do not find anything definitely original, apart from the pronouncement that suffering for the Son of man's sake is blessed. Nor again do we in the Woes, taken singly, except in the corresponding words, ' Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.' Of the five illustrations of fulfilment, the first three and the fifth are substantially paralleled. So, too, is the fourth, as far as the Golden Rule, except that we do not find the principle of non-resistance stated in so emphatic a form. As to the Rule itself, there are several passages which give it in its negative form. But the parallels to the positive form of the Rule all appear to be post-Christian. It would seem, then, that the positive, as distinct from the negative, form is new in the mouth of Christ. How far does this constitute originality? It is clear that the two forms very largely imply each other. Still, that form which lays stress upon the positive side of duty seems to have a just claim to be regarded as an advance upon the other. And, in addition, there is something new in the universal reference of the Rule, for in the parallels it appears to be mainly intended to apply only to fellow-Jews.

In the rest of the Sermon there is nothing for which definite originality can confidently be claimed. From the later Jewish literature, and also from Gentile sources, we know that several of the sayings in this part of the Discourse were proverbial, and this fact forbids our ascribing originality to them with any assurance, even though we do not find any very close parallels to them. Probably the warning against giving that which is holy to the dogs has the best claim of any of these sayings to be considered original.

Such, briefly, is the evidence supplied by our parallels. Our list, however, valuable as it is, is not an absolute guide.

It fails to do full justice, alike to the affinities and to the originality of the Discourse. On the one hand, if it was more exhaustive, the affinities might be seen to be somewhat greater. Also, it should be borne in mind that thoughts which are nowhere paralleled in the extant pre-Christian Jewish literature may yet owe their origin to some previous utterance of another mind. On the other hand, there is considerably more originality in the Sermon than is disclosed by a mere comparison of parallel passages. The parallels we have adduced are isolated texts, scattered here and there in the mass of Jewish literature. There is no Jewish writing which contains any close parallel to the Sermon as a whole, or even to any considerable section of it. And it would not be difficult to collect many sayings which diverge considerably from those of the Sermon; *e.g.* (to take but one instance) we read in Pirké Aboth 3<sup>14</sup>: 'Every one with whom the spirit of mankind is pleased, the Spirit of God is pleased with him. And every one with whom the spirit of mankind is not pleased, the Spirit of God is not pleased with him.' This is very different from Christ's teaching in the last of the Beatitudes and of the Woes. There is an element of originality, too, in the leading ideas of the Sermon, *e.g.* in the conception of the Kingdom. The qualifications for entrance, as there enunciated, are purely ethical and spiritual. In the whole idea of the Kingdom we see the large prophetic doctrine which emanated from Jeremiah and the later prophets of his school carried forward to its consummation and final term. Once more, the authoritative tone in which the teaching is delivered, and the implied personal claims of the Speaker, are new features. The prophets indeed spoke with authority, but it was the authority of God, and not their own. Our Lord, on the other hand, rested His teaching on His own authority. Whilst they proclaimed, 'Thus saith *Yahweh*,' He simply declared, '*I say unto you.*'

Comparison of the Sermon with the Jewish sacred literature clearly reveals another fact of great importance: viz. that, behind similarities in actual content, there lies a fundamental kinship and organic solidarity between the ethics of Christ and those of His forerunners. In both,



morality is vitally connected with religion, and the permanent source and ground of the moral order is seen in God. In both, the teaching is the deliverance of the moral consciousness, illuminated by the Spirit of God, of men who lived in humble dependence upon Him, and in the closest spiritual relationship with Him. The teaching of our Lord is the culminating and final deliverance of that consciousness. In the long history of God's gradual self-revelation to His chosen people, we see ethical discernment advancing *pari passu* with increasing enlightenment as to His being and character. Both find their consummation in the words of Christ. His moral teaching is the natural correlative of His perfect apprehension of God as universal and loving Father of mankind.

It is interesting at this point to notice what are the books with which the Sermon shows greatest affinity. Turning back to our list of parallels, we see that they are these: the Psalms, Second Isaiah and Proverbs among the canonical books<sup>a</sup>; and the Testaments, Slavonic Enoch, Sirach, Tobit and the Psalms of Solomon, among the non-canonical. Now the history of the development of Jewish religion shows that it is in these books that some of the loftiest and most matured ethical conceptions ever attained by the Jews before the coming of Christ are to be found. These latter it is which are taken up by Him and carried forward to completion.

There are one or two inferences from the facts we have so far noted which it will here be convenient to draw before we go further. First, the similarities between the teaching of our Lord and earlier Jewish ethics, while on the one hand they show indeed that we can only ascribe to it a limited degree of originality, on the other they strengthen its claim on our acceptance and allegiance. For they show that it is no mere isolated phenomenon in the field of ethics. On the contrary, it is backed by a whole mass of earlier teaching. It cannot therefore be lightly set aside. To divorce it from its Jewish context, and treat it as something utterly separate and apart, as is often done by its critics, is unhistorical and unfair. Those who would

<sup>a</sup> There are several parallels also to the Song of Hannah.

show us that Christ was wrong must convince us that all who preceded and led up to Him were wrong likewise. If it is conceded that His predecessors were right, then, *a fortiori*—since comparison shows that in His teaching we have the climax of a long and gradual growth in ethical discernment—He Himself was right also. Secondly, the Jewish parallels to our Lord's teaching lend support, not only to its actual content, but also to its underlying postulates and assumptions. It is important that this should be noted, for it is these latter, as well as the former, which are criticised and discountenanced by many to-day. It is inevitable that this should be so, for rejection of the one logically entails that of the other. To impugn the teaching of Christ is also, at least implicitly, to call in question the whole method and process by which that teaching was reached. We cannot here enter upon a detailed examination of the various strictures which have been passed. The point we wish to make is that the same postulates as those of the Sermon underlie the teaching of all the Jewish moralists, so that the two stand or fall together. Nietzsche, *e.g.*, in teaching that conscience has always been man's curse and is to be set aside, is in opposition, not to Christ alone, but to all the Jewish prophets who, like Him, trusted the deliverances of the moral consciousness, and regarded them as having objective validity. Thirdly, from what has been said it can be seen how far it is true to say that the ethical teaching of our Lord is endorsed by the moral consciousness of the modern world. Absolutely and without qualification, the statement is not necessarily or universally true. It is quite possible for our moral consciousness to find the teaching of Christ out of harmony with its own deliverances. The concrete judgements of the moral sense are not uniform. They vary according to individual character and training. A certain degree of moral education and development is necessary for the teaching of Christ to be wholly acceptable and appealing; *e.g.* it is not likely that the moral sense of an average set of schoolboys would endorse the action of one of their number who should literally fulfil Christ's precepts on non-resistance and love to enemies. Our moral judgements,

again, are not independent of our attitude towards religion. On the contrary, they are greatly affected by it. And this is especially the case in such matters as are dealt with by our Lord. Here the ethics and the religion cohere together, and no one who is not in sympathy with the latter is likely to be, or at least to remain, in full harmony with the former. What, then, can rightly be maintained is this:—that, in proportion as the whole being of the individual accepts and shares the religion of Christ, his moral consciousness will, in the measure of its sensitiveness, endorse His ethics. In this sense we may rightly claim that the conscience of humanity is the unfailing ally of Christ's teaching.

In saying this, we are not unmindful that the moral consciousness has its part to play in the sphere of religion, as well as in that of ethics. Indeed, it is only in thought that a sharp line of division can be drawn between the two. In life, the one always includes something of the other. And, in the history of the Jews, it was largely through the avenue of the moral consciousness of inspired men that the truths of religion were progressively revealed. It is just to the setting aside of our Lord's religious teaching, and to the criticism of His ethics in artificial separation from it, that much of the present antipathy to His moral teaching is due. As, in the history of the Jews, the revelation of moral truth advanced side by side with that of spiritual ; so, now, it is only when taken together, and not in isolation from each other, that their truth can be rightly apprehended and verified.

### I. THE *Interimsethik* THEORY.

We now pass from general considerations to a particular examination of some of the criticisms which have been levelled against our Lord's moral teaching. First, let us consider the *Interimsethik* theory of the nature of that teaching, according to which it was only intended by our Lord to guide the behaviour of His followers during the few months which He expected to intervene before the Judgement, and has but little value for us, whose outlook upon the future is so radically different. Will this attempt to discredit its value bear a candid examination ?

(1) Let us begin by assuming that the contrast between Christ's eschatology and our own is as great as it is represented to be by the upholders of the *Interimsethik* theory. Even granting this, it does not really follow that His ethic can have but little or no value for us. It does not on this account lose its appeal to our moral consciousness. Our common experience testifies that it appeals to us, provided we are in general sympathy with Christ's religious teaching, irrespectively of whether we adopt, in all its details, His eschatology, or that with which He is credited by certain critical scholars. That this is so, viz. that the moral consciousness points in the same direction, and leads to the same judgements, independently of eschatological outlook and expectation, is evidenced by the fact that the contents of our Lord's teaching are paralleled, and that to a considerable extent, in writings which date from times when eschatology loomed less large than in His own day, and was of a different character. Let us look at the matter for a moment in a quite general way, and ask, What is the effect upon moral teaching of belief in the nearness of a catastrophic Judgement? It is not, surely, to upset our moral judgements. What appear to us as good and evil, apart from eschatology, still appear so to us, however largely the eschatological idea may fill our thought. Yet, that eschatology does produce some modification in moral teaching is not to be denied. What, then, is the difference that it makes? The answer, to put it in a word, seems to be this. It strengthens the stress on moral qualities. How we must press forward with righteousness, if the Judge is at the door! (*cf.* 2 Peter 3<sup>11-13</sup>). It makes the teaching more intensely and more exclusively otherworldly. Consequently, it may well be less complete than it would otherwise have been. But this is not to say that it is less valuable. Indeed, inasmuch as the tendency of humanity is always to absorb itself in temporal matters at the expense of its spiritual and eternal interests, it may well be the more valuable on this very account. Applying now these thoughts to the teaching of our Lord, the truth seems to be this. It is quite likely that His eschatological outlook may have involved a sacrifice as regards the rounded com-



pleteness of His teaching. It may account for His omission to inculcate duties which imply and depend upon the continuance of the existing order ; and also for the presence in His teaching of precepts which discourage, or even discountenance, the fulfilment of such duties. But, on the other hand, His eschatological outlook may well have increased the value for us of His central thoughts, and the expression which He gave to them. Indeed, it may well be that it is to this very outlook that His positive message of other-worldliness owes not a little of its sublimity and its power.

(2) So far, we have been arguing on the assumption that all that which the ultra-eschatologists hold as to the divergence between Christ's outlook and our own is true. But there is much reason for thinking that the difference has been greatly exaggerated.

A critical study of the Gospel records shows that, to quote Canon Streeter, 'in the series Q, Mark, Matthew, there is a steady development in the direction of emphasising, making more definite, and even creating, sayings of our Lord of the catastrophic Apocalyptic type, and of thrusting more and more into the background the sayings of a contrary tenor.'<sup>a</sup> Thus, 'the nearer we get to Him (*i.e.* Christ), the greater is the emphasis on the present, the gradual, and the internal aspects of the Kingdom, and the greater the reserve with which the detail of contemporary Apocalyptic is endorsed.'<sup>b</sup> There is a marked difference between the Apocalyptic sayings of Mark and those of Q. In Mark 13 we have a systematic and detailed scheme of prediction. The apocalyptic of Q, on the other hand, is neither systematic nor detailed. It is rich in picturesque metaphor and illustration, but its content is vague and indefinite. It includes, indeed, the catastrophic element, but this is not so characteristic as teaching which implies a kingdom in some sense already present, and destined to increase by a gradual growth. Probably the process which we can trace by comparing Q with Mark had already begun at the time of the composition of Q. If so, even the Apocalyptic sayings attributed to our Lord in Q will

<sup>a</sup> *Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem*, p. 433.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 434.

probably be somewhat more definite than those actually uttered by Him.\*

These critical considerations apart, it is clear from the recorded sayings of our Lord that He did not simply reproduce the apocalyptic eschatology of His contemporaries. In His teaching, it appears in a transmuted form; *e.g.* apart from the relation in which He places Himself to future events, the following features mark it off from that of contemporary Jewish thought:—the stress which is laid on the moral dispositions necessary for entering the Kingdom, the conception of its gradual growth, the importance which is accorded to the individual, the more pronounced note of hope, the predictions of the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, and the announcement that the Gospel must be preached to all the nations.

It is doubtful, too, if eschatology had as much prominence in our Lord's mind as it appears to have had in those of His contemporaries. There is reason to think that it was their minds, rather than His own, which were dominated by thoughts respecting the future; and that His recorded sayings did not create, but merely reflected, that warmth and intensity of outlook which characterise the first century of our era. That eschatology should enter into His teaching was inevitable, for it is inseparable from religious ethics. But to maintain that it was the centre of gravity of His whole message, and that ethics were only subsidiary and incidental, is to traverse the plain testimony of the Gospel records. These show that He did not base His ethic on His speedy return, but on the eternal realities of things. The direct affinities of His teaching are rather with that which is most central in the Old Testament than with anything transitory and local. In the Sermon, He grounds the principles of love towards our enemies, and of mercy towards all men, on the character of the Heavenly Father Himself. That is a stable and changeless foundation; and what is so based must be as binding upon us to-day as it was upon the generation to which it was first delivered.

So much for the eschatology of our Lord. Passing now

\* It is interesting here to note that, in the Fourth Gospel, the eschatological element occupies a very subordinate place.

to our own outlook upon the future, it is perhaps not unnecessary to mention the fact that, notwithstanding all our recent acquisitions of scientific knowledge, we still have no sure proof of the permanence and stability of the natural order. That catastrophes do occur in worlds is certain from the observations of astronomy. We go to bed, sure that the sun will rise on the morrow. It is true that the evidence in support of our belief is continually accumulating; still, our faith passes beyond the evidence. The end may come at any time. And, as regards ourselves, that our tenure of this present life is but short and precarious is a truth of which we all receive frequent reminders.

All these considerations lead to the conclusion that the divergence between the eschatological outlook which may reasonably be ascribed to our Lord, and that which, according to reason, ought to be ours to-day, whatever that divergence may precisely be, is in any case very substantially less than it has been represented by exponents of the ultra-eschatological view.

(3) In regard to the ethical teaching contained in the Sermon, there is yet another reason why it would be unreasonable to think that it is emptied of value on account of the eschatology with which it is bound up. The Gospel records give many indications of a development and modification of our Lord's eschatological outlook as having taken place during the course of the Ministry. In the earlier period, it is upon the nearness of the Kingdom, its gradual growth, and the moral and spiritual qualifications for entering it, that we find the emphasis laid. The future realisation of the Kingdom in its completed form appears to be conceived as one brought about in the course of development according to the ordinary laws of spiritual growth. It is not till we come to the later period of the Ministry that we find stress laid on the death and resurrection of the Son of man, on His coming in glory and judgement, and on the signs which should precede that coming; or that the realisation of the future Kingdom is represented as suddenly and catastrophically effected by God Himself, and in language similar to that in which popular expectation found current expression. Also, there is ground for thinking that, in the

earlier part of the Ministry, eschatology entered less into our Lord's thought than it later came to do, as the course of events forced it to the fore. It can hardly be without significance that the Gospels assign a great ethical discourse to the earlier period of the Ministry, and a great eschatological discourse to the closing days of His earthly life.

## II. THE CHARGE OF ONESIDEDNESS.

Another objection to the value of Christ's teaching is based upon its alleged incompleteness as a guide to conduct. It fails, so it is said, to set forth an entire and well-balanced ideal. It lays great stress upon certain aspects of the ideal of life—aspects which we may freely grant to be of very high importance—but it is silent about others, of whose importance also there can be no question. Thus it is but a partial and one-sided ideal which it sets forth ; and this fact detracts considerably from its value.

Now is this objection a valid one ? Let us first consider the charge of incompleteness. How far is it true ? It is clear that our Lord's teaching enunciates principles rather than rules, and that many of these are very far-reaching. They can be applied to the whole of life. Nothing can be more comprehensive and inclusive than the twofold rule of love. Thus there is a sense in which our Lord's teaching is very complete. But, in another, it must be admitted by an impartial judgement that it is not so. Our meaning will be best explained by a few illustrations. In the first place, then, Christ's teaching is concerned with the ideal of goodness alone, and not with that either of truth or of beauty. Yet, our intellectual and aesthetic faculties are essential to our human nature ; and, indeed, the moral faculty itself cannot be properly exercised if the other two are starved. An harmonious development of all our powers must include intellectual and aesthetic culture as well as moral. Then again, our Lord's teaching is exclusively individual and personal. It does not propound moral principles directly for any collective units of society. Of a possible Christian state, not even the idea finds explicit expression. On the contrary, Christ's teaching implies that His followers are in a hostile environ-



ment, and encounter the hatred and persecution of the world in general. For the Christian Church, even, no principles of corporate ethics are provided. Yet the conscience of mankind needs guidance and instruction on corporate as well as on individual conduct. In no small measure, the present troubles of the world are attributable to the lack of high and loyally observed moral principles governing the relations between nations, and all smaller units of mankind. Speaking generally, the individual standard of ethics, in Christian lands at least, is far in advance of the corporate. Nor, again, has our Lord's teaching much to say on the individual's duty towards any of the social units of humanity. There is a good deal more in the Epistles of the New Testament than in the Gospels. To the ancient Greek, duty to the state came first and foremost. The fact that the average Christian to-day considers what he is in himself, in his secret soul, to be of so much greater importance than what he is as a citizen, is very largely due to the emphasis in Christ's teaching upon the individual aspects of religion. Now, however much we may approve the priority of the individual, and value the teaching which secured its recognition, we cannot close our eyes to the need for instruction on the social aspects of religious duty, especially in an age in which several causes are contributing to bring into greater prominence the corporate aspects of life. Again, as Sanday says, 'the ethical teaching of Jesus is almost confined to that side of ethics which touches upon religion. Allusions to civic and industrial duties are very few, and those negative rather than positive.'<sup>a</sup> But, in the modern world at least, the specialised religious life is only for the few, and the mass of men need guidance and ideals for life in close connexion with active industry and commerce. Once more, it is the passive and submissive aspects of duty, rather than the active and conative, upon which lies the main insistence of the teaching. This is no doubt why, to the average Christian mind, the petition 'Thy will be done' suggests passive submission under unavoidable trial so much more than free and active effort in furtherance of the cause of God.

<sup>a</sup> *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 87.

It is well that the incompleteness of our Lord's teaching should be quite frankly and freely acknowledged. The antipathy to it which is a feature of the moral thought of our times probably springs, in at least some degree, from a false view of its completeness, which has been widely entertained. That such a view does issue in pernicious practical consequences is not to be denied. Indeed, it does not seem beyond the truth to say that many deeply Christian lives have been more or less seriously impoverished and stunted because the precepts of Christ were held to have such strictly exclusive force that nothing besides what they enjoined mattered in life, or was worth striving for.

It is not difficult to give good reasons for the incompleteness which we have noted. In the first place, our records are fragmentary. As the ethics of the Sermon are but a very partial presentation of the ethics contained in the whole of the Gospels, so doubtless are the ethics recorded in the Gospels but a very partial presentation of those actually delivered by our Lord. But, as all the recorded teaching of our Lord is of the same general type and character, it is reasonable to infer that, even had all His words been preserved to us, the features of incompleteness to which we have referred would still, to a large extent at all events, characterise this entire body of His instruction. He does not seem to have aimed at exhaustiveness, or systematic teaching. His instruction was occasional, and treated of particular subjects as circumstances called them forth. In explanation of this, several good reasons readily suggest themselves. First, He took for granted the current Jewish moral code, which was familiar to His hearers. He aimed chiefly at arousing conscience, and insisted upon a few great principles, especially such as were not generally recognised. His first followers would continue to follow the moral ideal which had been set before them by their Jewish teachers, excepting those aspects of it which He had revised. Thus it is only as we Christians of a later age familiarise ourselves with the Jewish moral ideal of the first decades of our era, and combine this with the teaching of Christ in our own moral ideal, that we place ourselves alongside of His first followers.

Then, our Lord recognised the existence of the moral sense in man, and meant us to use the light which it affords (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Lk. 12<sup>57</sup>). His recorded teaching is not calculated to dispense us from its exercise; on the contrary, there is much in it which is deeply provocative of moral questioning. Again, He anticipated the illumination of His followers' minds by the Holy Spirit, and the revelation to them of whatever truths He had not taught them. Such a passage as Jn. 16<sup>12-14</sup> shows how foreign to the mind of Christ is the action of the Church when she has recourse only to written texts of Scripture for the resolution of great moral questions. Our Lord's comparative indifference to the extent of the written letter may be in large measure due to His strong assurance of the abiding presence and illumination of the living Spirit within the corporate society of His followers.

We recognise, then, the incompleteness of our Lord's teaching. We admit that there cannot be truthfully claimed for it that value which consists in exhaustive fullness. We are alive to the mischief which ensues when reverence dictates and presses a doctrine of absolute completeness, which is untrue to actual fact. But to say this by no means involves the surrender of the sense of the intrinsic worth and preciousness of what has been recorded. To this our moral intuitions ever testify. And the more we endeavour to fill out our Lord's teaching from the best that we can find in Jewish or Gentile literature, the more do His sayings shine forth as gems and jewels.

### III. THE STRICTURES OF NIETZSCHE.

Any treatment of current objections to Christian ethics would be very incomplete which did not include some reference to the theory of evolution. For it is to this theory that the modern reaction against Christian morals is, directly or indirectly, largely attributable. But it is impossible for us, in the space at our disposal, to enter upon a discussion of the difficult problems to which acceptance of the evolutionary theory has given rise. We will therefore confine ourselves to a few remarks, of a somewhat general character. In the first place, the evolutionary theory

enunciated by Darwin has been extended in its application from the physical sphere to all manner of other fields, on the mere assumption that it is a principle of universal application. This is an unwarrantable procedure. And, as a matter of fact, to the doctrine that the human race is in a process of moral and spiritual development, neither history nor experience appears to afford much support. Again, it has been too hastily assumed that, if the history of the moral sentiments could be traced back to humble origins, their present value and authority were discredited. Questions of origin have been mixed up with questions of value, without due discrimination being observed.

An objection which has been widely and strenuously pressed is that the Christian code of morals traverses the operation of the natural law of selection, and thus constitutes itself a stumbling-block in the path of evolution. Nietzsche, *e.g.*, vehemently charges Christianity with making for physical deterioration and decadence. As to this, we would say that, even if the breach between ethics and evolution is as great as it has been represented, we have no doubt that Huxley was right in upholding the former. But, in actual fact, it is a sustainable thesis that Christianity has in many ways furthered the physical progress of the race, and not least by its severe and lofty standard of personal morality.

Nietzsche's charge would have less to substantiate it if Christians had given more thought and attention to the implications of their Master's words. As we are shortly going to consider the implications of the Sermon sayings, it may not be out of place, at this point and in this connexion, to enlarge a little upon the importance of careful and thoughtful exposition. It must probably be conceded that there is at least an element of truth in Nietzsche's accusation, as directed against the type of Christianity which largely prevails to-day. This exerts great moral pressure in favour of the care and preservation of unfit and diseased humanity, and comparatively little in restriction of humanity's propagation of its disease and unfitness, whether physical, mental, or moral. And why so? It is because those principles which are explicitly laid down in



the N.T. have taken hold of the conscience of humanity vastly more than such as can only be deduced from N.T. teaching. This is inevitable in the absence of an orderly and systematic presentation by the Church of the whole field of ethical ideals, in which each principle—whether explicit or not in the pages of the N.T.—finds its appropriate place, and the measure of importance which rightly belongs to it. For the superficial readers of our open Bible are legion, while the thoughtful and devout students are but a small minority. There can readily be inferred from the N.T.—*e.g.* from all its teaching as to the duty of caring for the weak and the sick, from its precepts of love to all men, and from its doctrine of the infinite worth of the individual soul—the principle that the procreation of human life is a high responsibility. Taken in conjunction with the ascertained laws of heredity, the Christian teaching on self-sacrifice demands from many individuals a voluntary self-restraint, and from all a discipline and training with a view to fitness, in the matter of the bringing of children into the world. Nietzsche's remedy for the existing state of things is that mankind should cast off the altruistic feelings which Christianity has engendered and kept alive, and that it should freely allow all imperfect specimens of humanity to perish. The true Christian ethic discloses a far more excellent way. It is that men should continue to show all loving care for human life, however decadent the type may be, and to reverence and cultivate their philanthropic and altruistic instincts to the utmost ; but that the latter should be matched by a sense, equally strong, of the duty of bringing into existence the most healthy and vigorous specimens that eugenic conduct can promote, and of limiting procreation, by the voluntary sacrifice of individual liberty—enforced, as may be necessary, by the collective action of society—to such as are free from at least serious hereditary blemish. In a word, the Christian conscience ought to be as strongly eugenic as it is altruistic.

Before we leave this subject, there is one further point upon which it seems desirable to lay stress, *viz.* the strength of the appeal which our Lord's teaching makes to the heart

of every believer. Notwithstanding the reaction against it in not a little contemporary thought, there seems little ground to fear that it will lose its hold on the allegiance of the Western world. No other moral teaching can possibly exert so constraining an appeal. In the first place, unlike the doctrines of Nietzsche and other naturalistic moralists, in which radical inconsistencies can be detected,<sup>a</sup> it constitutes a consistent and coherent whole. Then, as we have already said, it is the natural correlative of Christ's teaching about God and the future life, so that the conscience of any one who accepts that teaching—and our conscience does, in the measure of its enlightenment, lead us to accept it—is constrained to endorse His moral teaching also. Again, it is perfectly embodied in a personal life. The agreement between Christ's example and His teaching is complete; so that what the Christian finds enjoined in the teaching of his Master he sees perfectly portrayed in the records of His life. Less perfectly indeed, yet markedly, the Christian ethic is manifested in the lives of the Apostles. Now this historical embodiment of the teaching greatly enhances the strength of its appeal to us, and helps us towards fulfilling it in ourselves. It provides a vivid illustration of the teaching, by exhibiting it as carried into practice amid the varying circumstances of life. Where moral teaching is presented in a set of precepts and statements alone, the mind can only master it by a synthetic intellectual process. But a personal example is in itself a synthesis of all the precepts, from which particular rules and principles may be drawn as called for by a process of analytic deduction. Again, the spirit of the Christian ethic coincides with that engendered in man by acceptance of Christ as personal Saviour. Take, *e.g.*, the Matthaean Beatitudes. Every one of the qualities here enumerated must be present in the heart which has sincerely laid hold upon Him as its personal Redeemer. Such qualities are the natural and inevitable correlative of the doctrine of the Cross. Again, the Christian ethic is sustained by august supernatural sanctions. It was enunciated

<sup>a</sup> This has been well exhibited by L. S. Thornton in his *Conduct and the Supernatural*.

in a tone of absolute authority by Him who is to every believer the eternal Son of God. It is upheld and taught by the Church, which is the institution in the world of His own appointment ; and it appeals to rewards and punishments, not in this life only, but also in that beyond the grave. Lastly, it is vindicated, as no other teaching is, by the application to it of the pragmatic test. If we ask what has been the practical outcome of the dissemination of the teaching of Nietzsche and his followers, the answer seems to be clear—viz. that the outbreak of the Great War, and the manner in which it was waged by the Central Powers, is largely attributable to its spread and influence. In the ideal of character set forth by our Lord, on the contrary, it is to the milder virtues that the supremacy is assigned, and its sincere adoption has always resulted in the growth of the spirit of sympathy and of love.

II. THE IMPORT OF THE SERMON TEACHING IN DETAIL. We now pass to the detailed consideration of the Sermon. In Chapter XI we have set forth what we believe to be the primary meaning of its contents (see pp. 169ff.) Building upon this, we shall now endeavour to draw out their implications, and to weigh their import. We shall make no attempt at completeness in our treatment. There is much true and valuable teaching which may be drawn from the Sermon, which yet takes no account of what its words conveyed to the first hearers. But with such we are not concerned. All we have to say will be based upon our exegesis.

1. *The Beatitudes and Woes.* There is much which these imply, besides what they directly teach:—*e.g.* (a) The value of blessedness or inward happiness. The word 'Blessed' is repeated as if it denoted a state of supreme good. The Beatitudes pronounced upon the persecuted imply that its attainment is worth the sacrifice of lower mundane happiness. (b) The importance of the state of the heart. This inward happiness depends on inward qualities. There are certain dispositions which constitute a state of bliss in their possessor. It follows that the state of the heart is to be esteemed of the highest consequence. (c) Men's hunger and thirst after goodness. Not only in

our third Beatitude, but in all of them, Christ assumes in His hearers a desire to live in accordance with God's will. He takes it for granted that there is that in man which can appreciate the ideal which He sets forth, and respond to the appeal which it makes to his moral and spiritual sense. (d) The world's hatred of the Christian ideal. The Beatitudes also imply the perversity of the unregenerate man's spirit. There is that in him which hates the ideal, and will persecute those who make it their own. Where it is not welcomed, it 'stings by its very beauty, and hardens by its very holiness.' The last two Beatitudes are sadly significant of human depravity, especially in their position at the close of the list, after the enumeration of beautiful and admirable qualities. One might have supposed that the Beatitudes would have closed with a warning against being carried away by the universal love and admiration which such qualities would engender in all hearts towards their possessors. Instead, we read of hatred, ostracism, obloquy and slander. Why should such qualities arouse such feelings in men? It can only be because, as Byron says:

'Our life is a false nature — 'tis not in  
The harmony of things.'<sup>a</sup>

Nothing less than a very deep corruption of human nature is implied in those explicit declarations, both here and elsewhere, which foretell hatred and persecution as the treatment which the disciples must expect at the hands of men. (e) The reign of law in the moral and spiritual spheres. It is the teaching of the Beatitudes that some dispositions carry blessing to their possessors, and others woe, according to the uniform laws of God. As Montefiore points out, they 'do not say "Do this, or be this, *because* you will gain a reward," or "Do not do this *because* you will be punished." But they say "A certain line of action, a certain disposition of mind bring happiness now and hereafter." The result follows necessarily from the cause. It is the law of God. "Heaven" and happiness follow as certainly from goodness, as their opposites follow from wickedness. The one is not an arbitrarily added reward;

<sup>a</sup> *Childe Harold*, iv. 126.



the other is not an arbitrarily added punishment. The result is contained in the premiss, as surely as the result of health-giving medicines or death-dealing drugs is already contained within them. The bliss of virtue, both "now" and "hereafter," is a continuous state, and not a something added *ab extra* to form a reward: and *mutatis mutandis*, the same may be said of vice.<sup>a</sup> Similar teaching is contained elsewhere in the words of Christ, and our modern sense of the reign of law and order in the natural world has made us more disposed to accept and appreciate its truth.<sup>b</sup> (f) Right relationship towards God the primary need. It may be somewhat fanciful to see in them a division between the first four and the rest corresponding to that between the two tables of the Decalogue, but it is our relation to God which is dwelt upon first. Inward happiness, then, they teach, in contradistinction to modern secularist altruism, depends on a right relationship, primarily towards God, and secondarily towards our fellows.

It cannot be supposed that the qualities which the Beatitudes express or imply are the only ones to which blessedness attaches. It is very possible that some only of the Beatitudes of the historical Sermon have been recorded.<sup>c</sup> In several other contexts of the Gospels Christ pronounces certain people 'blessed' (viz. Mt. 11<sup>6</sup> = Lk. 7<sup>23</sup>; Mt. 13<sup>16</sup> = Lk. 10<sup>23</sup>; Mt. 24<sup>46</sup> = Lk. 12<sup>43</sup>; Mt. 16<sup>17</sup>; Lk. 11<sup>28</sup>, 12<sup>37, 38</sup>, 14<sup>1</sup>, Jn. 13<sup>17</sup>, 20<sup>29</sup>). And the Beatitudes can be supplemented from Christ's teaching elsewhere; e.g. on love to God and to man, on faith, on prayer, and on many other moral and religious qualities upon which they do not touch. Several additional Beatitudes can readily be constructed out of the rest of Christ's teaching in the Sermon itself. Nor are we confined to the recorded words of our Lord in seeking to gain a full-orbed view of the life of blessedness. The blessedness which attaches to the dispositions here specified consists

<sup>a</sup> *Synoptic Gospels*, vol. ii. p. 485.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Gardner, *Evolution in Christian Ethics*, pp. 89 ff.

<sup>c</sup> Of logical sequence of thought between the individual Beatitudes it does not seem possible to trace any sure evidence. There is close parallelism between the first pair and the second, and the last two revert to the thought of the first, which is clearly the leading Beatitude.

in the fact that they bring man into right relationship with God and his fellows, and so introduce him into a state of moral and spiritual well-being. By pronouncing them blessed, Christ did not make them such, but revealed their intrinsic character. It follows that we can find numerous qualities, both in the Bible and outside of it, to which the epithet 'blessed' may be appropriately attached. To some extent we can also discover Beatitudes by looking within ourselves; for our moral and spiritual experience teaches us what qualities and dispositions do as a matter of fact conduce to inward happiness.

The Beatitudes of the Sermon then we regard as a partial presentation of the character in man to which the life of bliss belongs. In some measure, perhaps, we may consider them as a one-sided presentation. Taken as a whole, the virtues which they unfold are decidedly of a mild and passive, rather than of a strong and active, character. They are in striking contrast to the qualities which are most insisted upon in pagan ethics. In contrast they are, too, to the more positive and active qualities which the stress of war has called forth amongst us. And we can scarcely doubt that some at least of these are worthy of being styled 'blessed.'

But, if partial, they are exceedingly precious. They give a sketch of the childlike character. They describe the persecuted saints of God. They show at what a height true blessedness stands above the attainment of mere earthly good, and that it is often through suffering that the way to higher happiness lies. Experience testifies to their truth; but, had Christ not enunciated them, a very large proportion of the Christians of every age would have passed through life with but little conviction or experience of at least some of them. For the ideal which they depict stands out in bold relief from many others of what is admirable, both ancient and modern. However much it may be possible to supplement them, they are notable elements in the spiritual happiness attainable by man, and we may safely say that no qualities which are inconsistent with them can be truly blessed.

2. *The Revision of Moral Standards.* Mt. 5<sup>17</sup> declares

that evolution and not revolution is Christ's purpose with regard to the O.T. Scriptures. The principle here enunciated is one of far-reaching application, which extends beyond the sphere of ethics, and is not confined to the limits of the O.T. It holds good of the teachings contained in the Jewish extra-canonical Scriptures, and of those pertaining to natural religion; and, indeed, of all that is imperfectly good or true, wherever found.

The illustrations of the principle naturally divide into two classes. The first two (on murder and adultery) exemplify the same kind of fulfilment. In each, the precept is carried back from the outward act to the inward thought and feeling which are its source and origin. But in the last three (on perjury, retaliation, and love and hatred) the fulfilment is of a different character. Montefiore finds it hard to see here any fulfilment at all.<sup>a</sup> Yet, in a true sense, here also Christ's teaching seems to be a carrying forward to completion of the old. Let us consider each of the three instances separately. The Jewish law against perjury had regard to the duty of veracity and fidelity to promises. It did not, however, lay this duty down absolutely, but confined itself to the requirement that words attested on oath should correspond with truth or performance. Christ fulfilled this law by requiring an absolute fidelity to promise. With regard to the *lex talionis*, the case is not quite so obvious. The Law certainly enjoined it as a duty due to justice that a man should punish the offender. And, looking at it in this light, Christ seems simply to negative its teaching. But it has another aspect. Its original force was not only positive and mandatory, but also restrictive. It had regard to the excesses of vengeance to which man's unbridled passion is prone to run. It marked an ethical advance when first promulgated, for it curbed the lust for excessive retaliation, and limited this to an equal harm. Viewed in this light, it was fulfilled by Christ entirely forbidding what it had but restrained. Similarly, the precept 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy' has a double significance. On the one hand, it enjoins hatred towards the enemy. In this respect it is flatly con-

<sup>a</sup> *Synoptic Gospels*, vol. ii. pp. 488, 513.

tradicted by the precepts of Christ. But, on the other hand, it restricts hatred to the enemy, and enjoins love towards the neighbour. In this respect it marked an ethical advance upon more primitive teaching, and is in the line of evolution towards the higher doctrine of Christ.

Thus, in each of these three instances, the fulfilment is of the same character. It consists in entirely prohibiting what had previously been restricted only, and in requiring to be observed absolutely and universally that which previous legislation had enjoined to be observed only within limits. These, then, are extensions outwards; the boundaries restricting the areas covered by the precepts are removed, so that the extent of their application becomes unlimited.

*A. Murder and Adultery.* The general import of these two illustrations is that guilt attaches, not only to external acts, but also to the internal states of heart from which they take their rise. If we may apply to the first illustration the form of expression of the second, Christ's teaching is that he who is angry with his brother has murdered him already in his heart. Likewise, he who looks on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart. The emphasis is shifted from the outward and visible region to the inward and spiritual. Christ fastens upon the first beginnings of evil. Sinfulness, He teaches, is not to be estimated merely by its evil effects on society. These two illustrations show how the rest of the Ten Commandments—indeed all commands, both positive and negative, which relate to outward actions—should be 'fulfilled.'

For us, the application of this teaching extends beyond its primary reference. 'Brother' for us is synonymous with 'neighbour' as interpreted in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, and includes any fellow-man. The teaching as to adultery applies to women as well as to men, and to all cases where gratification in physical act would be morally wrong, even though not resulting in the actual sin of adultery. The general principle embodied in the words is that those states of heart which, if they issue in action, issue in evil, are themselves evil. The converse readily follows, viz. that those states of heart which, if they issue in action, issue in good, are themselves good.



Our Lord's words also teach the sinfulness of the intermediate stages between thought and action. They specify two, viz. words and looks. (*a*) In His teaching on murder, Christ declares guilt to attach to words which are the outcome of angry feelings, and He gives two illustrations of such words. This is in line with what He says elsewhere of our solemn responsibility for the words we utter. If we may so far press His language here, it teaches that greater guilt attaches to expressed anger than to unexpressed. Experience supports this, for, normally, a feeling is intensified and prepared for action by being put into words. (*b*) In His teaching on adultery, He declares guilt to attach to wrong desire gratified by the eye gazing upon its object. This agrees with what He elsewhere says of the eye causing men to stumble. That the eye can indeed be put to evil uses, excite wicked lusts, and induce their gratification in physical act, is matter of common experience.

In cases where the thought is not evil until there is some gratification of it, the first intermediate stage between thought and action will be the beginning of actual guilt. It is noteworthy that Christ does not condemn the bare feeling of lust as He does that of anger. Perhaps we may infer that actual guilt does not attach to bare ungratified desire. This may well be true of other sins—*e.g.* gambling. Gambling arises out of the fundamental and natural desire for gain. This desire is not in itself wrong ; sin is not involved, therefore, until the first step has been taken in the direction of its wrongful gratification.

B. *Oaths, Retaliation, Love and Hatred.* In these three examples, the 'fulfilment' consists in extending the range of the precept. We must be true to our word, not merely when on oath, but at all times. Not only must we restrict the taking of vengeance, we must take none at all. Not only must we limit our hatred towards our enemies, we must banish it entirely.

The principle of fulfilment which Christ here illustrates can be applied to all precepts of an imperfect morality. The Christian ideal admits of no compromise with what is evil. Therefore, all precepts which only restrict evil within certain

limits receive in it their fulfilment by being so extended as to forbid evil altogether.

The first two of these precepts primarily relate to external conduct. They can themselves be 'fulfilled' (after the manner in which Christ fulfils the commandments against murder and adultery) by being referred to the inward dispositions of heart from which the external acts proceed. They are thus brought into line with the third illustration. The full meaning, then, of the three is that we ought to banish utterly from our hearts the spirit of infidelity and falsehood, of vindictiveness, and of hatred. We are to be faithful and truthful in all the relations of life, and we are to have goodwill and love towards all men, including even those who wrong and hate us.

So much of import seems fairly clear. But the rules on oaths and non-resistance give rise to one or two important questions :

(1) How far are these rules to be interpreted as requiring literal observance? The answer depends on their conformity to the example and the general tenor of the teaching of Christ, and also (in lesser degree) of His Apostles. Applying this test, we find, as to the precepts on oaths, that we have no record of the use of an oath by our Lord Himself. As we have previously observed, His characteristic expression, 'Verily I say unto you,' seems to be a deliberately chosen substitute for the use of an oath ; and it is precarious to infer from Mt. 26<sup>63-64</sup> His sanction of being put on oath. The precepts of the Sermon are echoed by St. James (Ep. 5<sup>12</sup>). All this is in favour of a literal interpretation. On the other hand, St. Paul, several times in the course of his Epistles, makes a solemn appeal to God, which is a form of oath ; and in Hebrews we even read of God as swearing by Himself.

On the whole, the answer seems to stand thus : The real stress of Christ's teaching is upon the duty of abstaining, not from oaths, but from infidelity to one's promises. It is the principle behind the precept which is of paramount importance. But, if men were always true to their word, there would be no need of oaths to ensure that they fulfilled their promises. The ideal, therefore,

is that men should dispense with oaths altogether, and in this sense it is right to regard the precepts as requiring literal observance. But to interpret them as constituting a hard-and-fast rule to be literally observed independently of the cultivation of a sense of the sacredness and responsibility attaching to all spoken words would be to miss their real import.

With regard to the precepts on non-resistance, there is much reason for thinking that our Lord did not intend them to be taken as rules to be observed in the letter without exception. They are suspiciously detailed and specific. The general tenor of Christ's teaching is to enunciate broad principles of conduct, and to leave it to men to determine for themselves the precise application of those principles to particular cases. Thus His precepts here, if interpreted as precise and binding rules, would be out of harmony with the general character of His instruction. Also, His teaching contains precepts which cannot be intended to be literally interpreted, *e.g.* 'If thy hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off,' etc. It is therefore quite possible that, in the case of other injunctions where a literal interpretation might be supposed to be intended, such may yet not be meant. But further, as to the first of the rules before us, we have the guidance of Christ's own example. When at His trial He was struck by one of the officers of the High Priest, we are not told that He turned the other cheek, or proffered Himself for a second blow, but we read that He administered a calm rebuke to the smiter (Jn. 18<sup>22-23</sup>). Still less did St. Paul, when on trial before Ananias, literally fulfil this precept (Acts 23<sup>2-3</sup>). His demand of a public apology from the magistrates of Philippi (Acts 16<sup>35-40</sup>) shows how little he was inclined tamely to submit to injury. We infer, then, that our Lord did not intend these startling injunctions to be taken as universally binding rules. This, of course, does not mean that we are in no circumstances bound to act in literal accord with them, but only that we are not to feel under obligation to do so in all.

How, then, are we to determine when non-resistance to evil is to be literally practised, and when it is not? We cannot

do so unless we know all the principles which are in accordance with the mind of Christ, loyalty to which requires of us so to act, and also in what particular cases loyalty to these principles makes of us this demand. Such knowledge is obviously beyond our reach. But some things at least are fairly clear : (a) our Lord's purpose is to show that the spirit of retaliation is to have no place whatever within the Christian's heart. The instances which He gives are of conduct from which all vindictiveness is clearly absent. We may then safely say that all opposition to evil which springs from the natural inclination within us to retaliate is out of harmony with the mind of Christ. In so far as the expulsion of vindictiveness from our hearts leads us to practise non-resistance, that is our bounden duty. (b) But, further, the principle which can expel the desire for retaliation is love. Our love, says Christ, is to extend to our enemies. Therefore, in so far as the active principle of love within our hearts towards those who inflict injury upon us dictates the practice of non-resistance, that, again, is our bounden duty. But love does not always so dictate ; it may prescribe severity in dealing with the offender. The offender's own highest good will be the determining consideration. We may here quote the words of St. Augustine : ' As God dealt with men by Law and by Gospel, and the same love was in each, as the Law punished and the Gospel forgave, each for the bringing about an end beyond itself, and the same end, even the righteousness of the sinner, though they sought it by ways so different, so will there be counterparts to both in the wise and loving conduct of a Christian man toward his offending brother. The everlasting rule is, that thou render good for thy brother's evil : the shape in which thou shalt render it, love—which means something higher than a mere unwillingness to inflict present pain—shall prescribe.' <sup>a</sup> But, whilst this is true, non-resistance may very often be the true prompting of love in the class of cases contemplated by our Lord. Although His words with reference to the offender are quite general, it seems very probable, as we saw in Chapter XI, (see pp. 192ff) that He has in view only offences com-

<sup>a</sup> Quoted from Trench, *St. Aug. on the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 223, 224.



mitted by non-Christians against His followers. It is difficult to suppose that He contemplates the offences which He specifies as being inflicted by Christians. His words in Mt. 18<sup>15-17</sup> (*cf.* Lk. 17<sup>3</sup>), and those of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 5, teach that an injury done by one Christian to another is no light matter, nor one which the injured person has the right to overlook. Very possibly then our Lord, in giving these precepts, had in mind the effect which such behaviour on the part of His followers would have in leading to the conversion of the offender. And perhaps a very literal observance of His injunctions would prove a more powerful influence in this direction than is commonly recognised. (c) But considerations other than this may have been also present to our Lord's mind. He may, *e.g.*, have thought of the effect on others which such conduct would produce; of the witness before the world which His followers could thus give. The practice of non-resistance is arresting; it impresses mankind, and thus has a missionary value. He may also have had in mind the effect of such conduct upon those who practise it. It is a form of self-denial which deepens the religious life, and intensifies our trust in God and our dependence upon Him. Probably, then, there is a larger place in the truly Christian life for the literal observance of the rule of non-resistance than is commonly supposed. Too often it has been so far explained away that little or no room has been left for its literal fulfilment.

(2) Another question which arises out of this teaching concerns its bearing upon the judicial system of the State. Of course it has no primary reference to that system, or to any constituted authority. The words 'whosoever would go to law with thee' show that public justice lies in the background behind the precepts. It is interesting, too, to notice that the one incident in Christ's life which may seem to give some sanction to the use of the oath is connected with public justice. Now the State, as we must admit, is bound, in her organisation and her legislation, to contemplate all her members, and to adapt herself to their moral level as a whole. She is under obligation, as the private individual is not, to have regard to the protection and security of the

public. How far, then, is Christ's teaching applicable to the State? The question is thus answered by Sanday: 'It is not clear that the Christian type would be what it is if it were not built upon, and if it did not presuppose, a certain structure of society, to which other motives had contributed. The ethical ideal of Christianity is the ideal of a Church. It does not follow that it is also the ideal of the State. If we are to say the truth, we must admit that parts of it would become impracticable if they were transferred from the individual standing alone to governments or individuals representing society. It could not be intended that the officers of the law should turn the cheek to the criminal. The apostles were to bear no sword, but the judge "beareth not the sword in vain."'<sup>a</sup> There is no doubt much truth in these words. The requirement by the State of the oath as a security for fidelity or truthfulness may be upheld by those who believe that the Christian ideal is to dispense with oaths altogether. It is certainly much easier to defend than the practice of the Church in requiring it from members of her own communion, and especially from her ordained ministers. The penal system of the State may be defended as necessary for the protection of life and property. But, in proportion as the individuals composing the State are truly Christian, its practice too ought to tend towards the Christian ideal; and, indeed, it does in fact so tend. The judicial system derives ultimately from the primitive law of retaliation, in which the injured man himself exacted retribution from the offender. But, in the modern Christian State, penalties are in large degree administered, not in the spirit of this old law, but with a view to the reformation of the offender.

With regard to the Golden Rule, it is clear that the words 'as ye would that men should do unto you' can only be rightly referred to such desires of ours as are legitimate and reasonable, and in accordance with our highest good. On the other hand, the application of the precept is not limited to outward actions; it extends to inward thoughts and

<sup>a</sup> *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 89.

feelings. We are to think of others, and to feel towards others, in all respects as we can rightfully desire that they should think of, and feel towards, ourselves. Obviously, it is only in the power of a real love towards our fellow-men that this precept can be fulfilled.

Passing now to the precepts on love towards enemies, it is clear that for us these apply to all enemies, personal as well as racial and religious. The motive appealed to, 'that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven,' shows this to be the case. But how, it may be asked, is it possible to love one's enemies? We cannot do better than quote in answer the words of Dean Rashdall: 'It is not Christ alone but almost all the higher Moralists who have used the term "love" to indicate two things: (1) a state of the desires, emotions, and will directed towards the good of one's fellows, and (2) the spontaneous feeling of special attachment to particular persons—affection such as our Lord is recorded to have expressed for the rich young man, for Lazarus and his sisters, for the "disciple whom Jesus loved." This fact—I suspect a universal fact—of language has obviously a foundation in the facts of moral Psychology. The ideal relation between human beings is one in which the will of each is as steadily directed towards the good of every other human being as it is towards his own good or that of persons towards whom he feels the strongest emotional attraction; and in proportion as this attitude is realized, an emotion is felt which is to some extent the same, though to some extent different, from the feeling entertained towards friends. The feeling entertained towards the personal friend is the feeling of good-will based upon personal liking or attraction. Language can only express the ideal feeling towards one's fellows as such by generalizing the terms naturally used to indicate personal affection (*ἀγάπη, φιλία, amor, dilectio, caritas*).'<sup>a</sup> This is not to deny that the command here given is above man's natural instincts, and, as most people would admit, above his natural powers. The coupling of the duty of prayer with that of love is noteworthy, for, as with true insight William Law says, prayer for any one helps us to love him. But

<sup>a</sup> *Conscience and Christ*, pp. 189, 190.

in truth this precept is one of many in the Sermon which look forward to Pentecost, since it is only in the power of the Holy Spirit that it can be fulfilled.

3. *Warnings against criticising others.* These raise the question, How are we to understand our present attitude towards our fellows as bearing a direct relation to God's future attitude towards ourselves? The answer surely is, not that God will act towards us in the spirit of the *lex talionis*, as Montefiore thinks,<sup>a</sup> but rather that our attitude towards our fellows is an indication of our own state of heart. A harshly critical temper in regard to others' faults is inconsistent with true self-knowledge, and so with genuine penitence and humility. It thus betokens a wrong relation to God, and the absence of those fundamental dispositions which are essential, according to the teaching of the N.T., to man's appropriation of His mercy and forgiveness.

4. *The Duty of Discrimination in Publishing Sacred Truth. The Good and the Bad Tree, and the Good and the Bad Heart.* The precept 'Give not that which is holy,' etc., teaches a wise reserve in the communication of sacred things. For us its application is not limited to Christian teaching, but embraces all matters of religion, including the sacraments and other holy rites. It implies the corruption of human nature. Only a deep-seated depravity and perversity of spirit can lead men to trample holy things under their feet, and to turn and rend the givers of them. It implies also that the risk of the irreverent treatment of holy things, and of the maltreatment of the giver of them, is a thing to be avoided. The order in which these are mentioned suggests that the former is to be held more serious than the latter, and that it is a graver offence for the sacred things of religion to suffer sacrilegious treatment than for the ministers of them to encounter violence and hostility.

Again, the whole precept seems to imply an ardent wish in the disciples to give to others of that which Christ had given to them. It is lest this eagerness should overstep the bounds of prudence that our Lord gives them this

<sup>a</sup> *Synoptic Gospels*, vol. ii. p. 546.



warning. The spirit of eagerness itself is of course commendable, and is elsewhere enjoined by Christ (Mt. 10<sup>8</sup>).

It would be beside our purpose to enter here into a discussion of the ecclesiastical doctrine of 'Reserve.' Suffice it to say that, if our interpretation is correct, this passage does not justify the reservation of truth by Christian teachers as a policy within the Church, but merely requires the law to be observed that some spiritual hunger in the hearers should be a first condition of readiness to impart to them that which is holy. And this view is supported by the fact that, in the whole picture given us of apostolic action in the early Church, there is no trace of any teaching being withheld from the humblest member of the community.

In the remainder of this section, the principle is laid down that a man's outward life is the revelation of his inward character. The nature of a man manifests itself in his acts as does that of a tree in its fruits. Here too, then, there is taught the supreme importance of a good inward nature. The principle bears upon the question of the true relation between faith and works in the Christian doctrine of justification, but into this also we must refrain from entering. It is clear, however, that if by faith we mean a living trust which brings our inmost being under the influence of the Spirit of God, then it is only in thought that we can separate faith and works. Good works are always the spontaneous manifestation and outcome of the renewed nature which is the result of faith.

5. *The Duty of Doing as well as Hearing.* The central import of this closing passage seems to be the importance of building character on solid foundations. Probably we may interpret the rock of the eternal world to which man's spirit belongs. Our Lord, then, here teaches the duty of building our life into God, and not into the sands of fleeting time. This can only be done by faithfully realising in our lives whatever ideals have been revealed to us. As Trench puts it, 'In one way only does that which is heard win a stable foundation in the soul, that is, through being turned into action, when the heard is also the done.'<sup>a</sup> But, as we have previously noticed, the doing of which our Lord here

<sup>a</sup> *St. Aug. on the Sermon on the Mount*, p. 319.

speaks cannot mean only the bringing forth in outward act of that which is good. It includes also the being in ourselves good. And, His teaching being such as it is, His warning is best attended to by allowing His words to sink deeply into our minds, there to become germinating ideas which shall direct and influence our whole lives.

III. THE MESSAGE OF THE SERMON TO OUR OWN AGE.—It remains for us to consider the bearings of these great principles upon the spirit of the present age. If there is truth in the estimate we have framed of the value of Christ's teaching, then the Sermon sayings must contain a message of real importance for ourselves. We shall therefore now endeavour briefly to analyse in some detail what we conceive the content of that message to be.

(a) Firstly, we are living in an age whose perceptions of, and aspirations after, right, have been darkened and checked by the devastating licence of war. A spirit of laxity in morals pervades all classes of society, in both Church and State. It is an age, therefore, in which, as it appears to us, men especially need to have brought home to them the lofty moral ideal enshrined within the Sermon, an ideal which enunciates principles that are essential, alike to the true well-being of the State and to the influence for good of the Church upon the world.

(b) Secondly, there is a strong tendency amongst us to divorce ethics from religion, and to assume that good morals can be adequately sustained, apart from religion, by such means as education and legislation. The Sermon, on the contrary, exhibits ethics as rooted and grounded in religion; and, in so doing, provides, as we believe, a much-needed corrective to a pernicious way of thinking.

(c) Thirdly, the morality of the popular ideal is largely that of external good behaviour, and conformity to conventional standards of conduct. The Sermon, on the other hand, teaches that all outward actions take their rise from inward states of heart, and sets forth a moral ideal which touches the very springs of thought and feeling. It provides, too, a not unneeded reminder of the importance of the individual. Whilst the tendency of modern efforts to regenerate mankind is to concentrate upon the amelioration

of social conditions, and to trust that the improvement of the individual will of necessity follow, it is primarily to the regeneration of the individual that the teaching of our Lord has reference. That teaching has a profound corrective, also, to administer to the spirit of the popular ideal. That spirit is largely hedonistic. What is aimed at is the maximum of happiness and pleasure for every individual member of society. The Christian ideal, on the other hand, is deeply saturated with the spirit of the Cross.

(*d*) Again, the view of human nature which governs popular thought is largely Pelagian. This view is connected with shallow ideas of progress. It is supposed that mankind has far outgrown any deep-seated taint and corruption which it may have had in the dim past. Human nature has now moved upwards so far as to be fundamentally and essentially sound and good. The reform of external conditions of life will suffice to banish evil, and to effect all the improvement that is desired. Our Lord, on the other hand, gives no countenance to such views ; but shows clearly that the heart of unregenerate man was in His eyes desperately sick. And surely a multitude of facts, of common occurrence amongst us, testify that His view is but the sober truth as regards humanity to-day.

(*e*) Again, one of the world's greatest needs is such an improvement in international relations as shall safeguard her future peace. As the result of the long conflicts of the past, of which the late war was in one aspect the continuation, the principle of nationality has been securely established. Nationalism, at best a temporary passion, needed for the safeguarding of what is valuable in nationality, has grown into a serious menace. It needs curbing and restraining ; it needs converting and christianising. That is to say that there require to be applied to it the great moral principles of the Sermon ; and, not least, the precept, 'Love your enemies,' which we have seen to have a primarily national reference. It is because the laws of morality have been treated as differing in their incidence as they relate to nations on the one hand and to individuals on the other, and the nation as such has been so widely conceived as beyond the pale of the laws of Christian

conduct, even to the point of being morally free to apply the rule of force to the achievement of any objective which is accepted as essential to the determination of its political exigencies, that the catastrophe of war has been so recurrent a phenomenon of history. The establishment of an index of value for the morality of the State, as the expression of the aggregate ethical responsibility of all its individuals, similar to that which obtains in private morality, and equally governed by the teachings of Christ, can alone provide the basis upon which the Christian world can be federated and relations of harmony and understanding be established between the Christian and the non-Christian sections of the human race. It is because the code of the League of Nations is so notable and sincere an effort in this direction that every endeavour to secure its loyal and willing adoption by the nations of the world merits so well the wholehearted sympathy and support of all true Christians and peace-lovers.

(f) This brings us to another great problem of our age, viz. the problem of race. It has fallen to us in this century to witness the rise, in all the coloured races of the world, of a strong movement towards self-determination. The 'rising tide of colour' is a very real fact to-day. With one voice the coloured peoples are revolting against domination and exploitation by the white man, and are clamouring for liberty to control increasingly the current of their own lives. Many leaders amongst them are preaching armed force and bloodshed as the only effective means of attaining their objectives.

On the other side, in the white world, the spirit of domination and even of tyranny is still powerful and defiant. Although it would seem plain to-day, if ever, to every thoughtful man that there is no real security to be obtained by the sword, yet many are still putting their faith

‘ In reeking tube and iron shard,’

and even talking of the right of self-interest to dominate life, and of ‘ the glittering prize ’ for the man with ‘ the sharp sword.’

Thus, whether we look at the will to self-determination



among the coloured races, on the one side, with its aggressiveness, its selfishness, and its bitterness ; or at the will to domination of the white man, on the other, with its haughtiness, its selfishness, and its heartlessness, we see the deep need of a new spirit. It is only a change of heart on both sides that can heal the widening breach, and avert the awful peril of inter-racial war. And it is in the teaching of the Sermon that we find enunciated those fundamental dispositions of heart and laws of conduct that alone can guide the feet of both East and West into the way of peace.

(g) Another great and widely felt need of our times is for closer relationships between the divided Churches of Christendom ; for such a *rapprochement* as shall eventually lead to actual reunion. Here, too, the principles of the Sermon must be applied, if there is to be any real prospect of success. For it is only in the atmosphere created by 'poverty of spirit' (that expressive Matthaean phrase) that such counsels can thrive and mature. Again and again in history, efforts after reunion have been frustrated owing to the lack of humility and penitence. Nothing can take their place, or make up for their absence, not even the most brilliant gifts or the most compelling arguments. They are absolutely essential. And what is true of our unhappy religious divisions is also true of all our secular disputes. It is of a deep infusion of the spirit of Christ's teaching that the whole industrial world stands in sore need to-day.

(h) Once again, the Sermon has a message to the general spirit of our age. What is the nature of the aspirations of the modern world ? Clearly they are very largely of a purely material order. The kingdom that men are seeking is a kingdom of this present world, a kingdom in which social right and universal well-being are firmly established. And it is to economics and to politics that men are looking for the realisation of their ideals.

Now, among the Jews of Christ's own day there seemed to be special justification for concentration of the nation's efforts upon political and material aims. For it was groaning under a double servitude and was subjected to many wrongs. The first task which seemed to lie to the hand of every patriot was that of restoring the country

to independence, and of establishing within it a righteous government. Our Lord seemed to many to be marked out as the man who should perform this very service. Yet He did not liberate the nation, nor yet give encouragement to the active patriotism of Pharisee or Zealot. What He did was to declare that His kingdom was not of this world, and to deliver to His generation His spiritual and otherworldly teaching.

What, then, has the Sermon to say to that social idealism which represents the main stream of contemporary thought and action? Briefly, this. Its aim, admirable as it is, is neither high enough nor inclusive enough. It is far too worldly and material to constitute a complete and satisfying ideal. Far above the ideal of earthly good, and worth the sacrifice of it all, stands that of inward bliss. This is independent of all that happiness in its worldly sense implies. Through the possession of inward qualities alone can it be attained. And such is the nature of the human heart that, even when the programme of the most exacting social idealist had been fully carried out, men would be no more 'blessed,' in the true sense of the word, than they now are, apart from a deeper and more abiding recognition of the spiritual order to which all their activities rightly belong. The material and practical objectives which are so congenial to the genius of the modern world need, in short, to be supplemented and consecrated by, and to be brought into organic relation and due subordination to, the spiritual and otherworldly ideal enunciated by our Lord.

We conclude then that in the Sermon on the Mount we have a priceless document containing a manifold message to the age in which we live: a message which provides the corrective of its errors, both of thought and of action, the redress of its imperfect and inadequate aims and ideals, and the true and only way along which it can proceed towards a solution of its many and great problems. It is therefore a message of the diligent elucidation of which, as of the intelligent proclamation and the earnest application, our age stands in very real and deep need.

If the history of Germany during the past half-century is proof of the enormous influence which perverse moral ideas can exert upon a whole people in a comparatively short space of time ; if reactionary teaching can have such far-reaching consequences for evil, when clearly enunciated and assiduously pressed upon the minds of the young ; how great might be the results for good of the ethics of the Gospel, were they clearly set forth and energetically inculcated upon every grade of society in every land. It may be that the future peace of Europe, nay even of the world, hangs upon the measure in which the Christian Church clarifies her moral vision in the coming years, and infuses into men everywhere the great ideal—higher far than those which now occupy them—which has been entrusted to her keeping.

## PRINCIPAL WORKS USED OR CITED

- Abrahams, Israel : *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. Cambridge, 1st Series 1917, 2nd Series 1924.
- Abrahams, Israel : *Essay on Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis in Cambridge Biblical Essays*. London, 1909.
- Allen, W. C. : *St. Matthew*. Edinburgh, 1907.
- Bacon, B. W. : *The Sermon on the Mount*. New York, 1902.
- Bengel, J. A. : *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. 3rd Ed. London, 1862.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin : *The First Three Gospels*. London, 1890.
- Charles, R. H. : *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.* Oxford, 1913.
- Charles, R. H. : *Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford, 1908.
- Charles, R. H. : *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. London, 1908.
- Charles, R. H. : *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian*. London, 1899.
- Dalman, Gustaf H. : *The Words of Jesus*. Edinburgh, 1902.
- Deissmann, Adolf : *Bible Studies* : 2nd Ed. Edinburgh, 1909.
- Deissmann, Adolf : *Light from the Ancient East*. London, 1910.
- von Dobschütz, E. : *The Eschatology of the Gospels*. London, 1910.
- Edersheim, Alfred : *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. London, 1906.
- Gardner, Percy : *Evolution in Christian Ethics*. London, 1918.
- Gore, Charles : *The Sermon on the Mount*. London, 1896.
- Harnack, Adolf : *The Sayings of Jesus*. London, 1908.
- Harnack, Adolf : *What is Christianity?* London, 1904.
- Hawkins, Sir J. C. : *Horae Synopticae*. 2nd Ed. Oxford, 1909.
- Illingworth, J. R. : *Christian Character*. London, 1906.
- Kenyon, Sir Frederic G. : *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.* London, 1901.
- Lightfoot, John : *Horae Hebraicae*. Gandell's Ed. Oxford, 1859.
- Lyttelton, The Hon. E. : *The Sermon on the Mount*. London, 1905.
- Mackail, J. W. : *The Sayings of Christ Collected and Arranged from the Gospels*. London, 1917.
- Moffatt, James : Article on *The Sermon on the Mount* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. London, 1903.
- Montefiore, C. G. : *The Synoptic Gospels*. London, 1909.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich : Works translated into English, ed. by Oscar Levy. Edinburgh, 1909-1915.
- Ottley, R. L. : *Christian Ideas and Ideals*. London, 1909.



*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* : ed. by William Sanday. Oxford, 1911.

Plummer, Alfred : *St. Matthew*. London, 1910.

Plummer, Alfred : *St. Luke*. Edinburgh, 1905.

Rashdall, Hastings : *Conscience and Christ*. London, 1916.

Robinson, J. Armitage : *The Study of the Gospels*. London, 1911.

Rushbrooke, W. G. : *Synopticon*. London, 1880.

Sanday, William : *Outlines of the Life of Christ*. Edinburgh, 1905.

Savage, H. E. : *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. London, 1910.

Schürer, Emil : *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. 1898-1900.

Seeley, Sir J. R. : *Ecce Homo*. London, 1910.

Strong, T. B. : *Christian Ethics*. London, 1897.

Strong, T. B. : *Essay on Christian Ethics in Lux Mundi*. London, 1890.

Taylor, C. : *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*. Cambridge, 1897.

Tholuck, F. A. G. : *Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount*. Edinburgh, 1865.

Thornton, L. S. : *Conduct and the Supernatural*. London, 1915.

Tischendorf, Constantinus de : *Synopsis Evangelica*. 5th Ed. Leipzig, 1884.

Trench, R. C. : *St. Augustine on the Sermon on the Mount*. 3rd Ed. London, 1869.

Troeltsch, Ernst : *Protestantism and Progress*. London, 1912.

Votaw, C. W. : Article on *The Sermon on the Mount* in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*. Extra vol.

Wetstein, J. J. : *Commentary on the N.T.* 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1751-1752.

Wright, Arthur : *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*. London, 1903.

Wright, Arthur : *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. London, 1900.

Wright, Arthur : *Some N.T. Problems*. London, 1898.

## INDEX OF THE SERMON PASSAGES

## ST. MATTHEW

- 4<sup>23-5</sup> 2: 77  
 4<sup>23-25</sup>: 42, 43  
 4<sup>25</sup>: 49  
 5<sup>1</sup>: 43, 44  
 5<sup>1-2</sup>: 50  
 5<sup>3ff</sup>: 61ff, 101ff, 169ff, 209f, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 222, 226, 227, 230, 231, 245, 246ff  
 5<sup>3</sup>: 141f, 218  
 5<sup>4</sup>: 104, 144f  
 5<sup>5</sup>: 142f, 220, 221  
 5<sup>6, 7, 8, 9, 10</sup>: 77ff  
 5<sup>6</sup>: 103f, 143f, 220, 221  
 5<sup>7</sup>: 145f, 220  
 5<sup>8</sup>: 105, 146f  
 5<sup>9</sup>: 147, 221  
 5<sup>10-11</sup>: 132 n, 147f, 193, 220, 221  
 5<sup>12</sup>: 50, 106ff  
 5<sup>13</sup>: 53f, 70  
 5<sup>14</sup>: 75ff  
 5<sup>15</sup>: 54f, 69  
 5<sup>16</sup>: 75ff  
 5<sup>17-48</sup>: 68f  
 5<sup>17</sup>: 80ff, 108, 149f, 211, 215  
 5<sup>18</sup>: 68f  
 5<sup>19-20</sup>: 82f  
 5<sup>21-22</sup>: 83, 86  
 5<sup>21</sup>: 150  
 5<sup>22</sup>: 108f, 150ff, 211, 215, 216, 218, 221  
 5<sup>23-24</sup>: 86f  
 5<sup>25-26</sup>: 69  
 5<sup>27-28</sup>: 83  
 5<sup>27</sup>: 153  
 5<sup>28</sup>: 154f  
 5<sup>29-30</sup>: 55, 58f, 87, 89  
 5<sup>31</sup>: 83  
 5<sup>32</sup>: 55f, 58f, 68f  
 5<sup>33-37</sup>: 83f, 87, 155f  
 5<sup>34</sup>: 109  
 5<sup>34-37</sup>: 220  
 5<sup>38-39a</sup>: 81, 84ff, 87f  
 5<sup>38</sup>: 156  
 5<sup>39-41</sup>: 156ff  
 5<sup>39-42</sup>: 213, 214, 220  
 5<sup>39</sup>: 109f, 215  
 5<sup>40</sup>: 110  
 5<sup>42</sup>: 110f, 158f  
 5<sup>43</sup>: 84ff, 87f, 159f  
 5<sup>44, 89b, 40, 42, 46-47, 45, 48</sup>: 61ff  
 5<sup>44-48</sup>: 160ff  
 5<sup>44</sup>: 112, 214, 215  
 5<sup>45</sup>: 112f  
 5<sup>46-47</sup>: 211  
 5<sup>46</sup>: 113f  
 5<sup>47</sup>: 114f  
 5<sup>48</sup>: 115f, 216, 220  
 6<sup>1-16</sup>: 57f  
 6<sup>1-8, 14-18</sup>: 91ff  
 6<sup>9-13</sup>: 66  
 6<sup>19-21</sup>: 66f  
 6<sup>20</sup>: 20  
 6<sup>22-23</sup>: 5, 67  
 6<sup>24</sup>: 4, 67  
 6<sup>25-33</sup>: 66  
 6<sup>33b</sup>: 56  
 6<sup>34</sup>: 96  
 7<sup>1ff</sup>: 195ff  
 7<sup>1-2</sup>: 162f, 196f, 211, 214, 215, 218, 219  
 7<sup>1</sup>: 116  
 7<sup>1, 2b</sup>: 61ff  
 7<sup>2</sup>: 116f  
 7<sup>2a</sup>: 96f  
 7<sup>2b</sup>: 56  
 7<sup>8-5</sup>: 4, 50, 61ff, 164, 211  
 7<sup>3</sup>: 117  
 7<sup>4</sup>: 117f  
 7<sup>5</sup>: 4, 118  
 7<sup>6</sup>: 50, 97, 138, 164f, 195f, 199ff, 230  
 7<sup>7-11</sup>: 67f  
 7<sup>7a</sup>: 56  
 7<sup>12</sup>: 61ff, 111f, 159, 211, 213, 218, 230  
 7<sup>13-14</sup>: 68  
 7<sup>15</sup>: 97

7 16-18 : 59  
 7 16 : 218f  
 7 16b : 119f  
 7 16, 18 : 61ff, 118, 165, 211, 218  
 7 17, 20 : 98f  
 7 18 : 118f  
 7 19 : 60  
 7 21, 24-27 : 61ff, 216, 217, 218  
 7 21 : 120f, 166f, 212, 221  
 7 22-23 : 68  
 7 24-27 : 167f, 212  
 7 24 : 121ff  
 7 25 : 124  
 7 26 : 124  
 7 27 : 124f  
 7 28-29 : 50  
 10 24-25 : 71, 117, 163f, 211  
 12 33-35 : 59, 118, 165f, 211  
 12 33-37 : 99  
 12 33 : 70, 119, 218, 219  
 12 34b-35 : 70, 120  
 12 35 : 219  
 15 14 : 71, 117, 163, 211, 214

## ST. LUKE

6 12 : 45  
 6 12-16 : 14  
 6 12-19 : 49  
 6 17 : 49, 50, 51  
 6 17-19 : 14, 50  
 6 17-20 : 44  
 6 20a : 49  
 6 20b-23 : 61ff, 101ff, 169ff, 209f, 213,  
 214, 215, 216, 217, 219, 222, 226,  
 227, 230, 231, 246ff  
 6 20b : 141f, 218  
 6 21a : 103f, 143f, 220, 221  
 6 21b : 104, 144f  
 6 22-23 : 132 n, 147f, 193, 220, 221  
 6 24-26 : 74f, 108, 175f, 210f, 216, 227,  
 230, 231  
 6 24 : 148, 217, 219  
 6 25 : 148f, 219  
 6 26 : 50, 149, 221

6 27a, 28b : 160ff, 214, 215  
 6 27a, 28b, 29-30, 31, 32-33, 35b, 36 : 61ff  
 6 27a : 80f, 86, 87, 109  
 6 27b, 28a : 88  
 6 28b : 109, 112  
 6 29-30 : 213, 214, 220  
 6 29 : 156ff  
 6 29a : 109f  
 6 29b : 110  
 6 30 : 110f, 158f  
 6 31 : 111f, 159, 211, 213, 218, 230  
 6 32-33 : 211  
 6 32 : 86, 113f  
 6 33 : 114f  
 6 34, 35a : 88ff  
 6 35b : 112f, 116  
 6 36 : 115f, 216, 220  
 6 37ff : 195ff  
 6 37, 88 : 162f, 196f, 214, 215, 218, 219  
 6 37 : 116  
 6 37a, 38b : 61ff  
 6 37b, 38a : 99f  
 6 38 : 116f  
 6 39 : 117  
 6 39a : 100  
 6 39b : 71, 163, 211, 214  
 6 40 : 71, 117, 163f, 211  
 6 41-42 : 4, 50, 61ff, 164, 211  
 6 41 : 117  
 6 42 : 4  
 6 42a : 117f  
 6 42b : 118  
 6 43-44 : 61ff, 70, 211, 218  
 6 43-45 : 59, 118f, 165f  
 6 44a : 119, 219  
 6 44b : 119f, 218f  
 6 45 : 70, 120, 211, 219  
 6 46-49 : 61ff, 216, 217, 218  
 6 46 : 120f, 166f, 212, 221  
 6 47-49 : 167f, 212  
 6 47 : 121ff  
 6 48b : 124  
 6 49a : 124  
 6 49b : 124f  
 7 1 : 49, 50

## INDEX OF SERMON WORDS AND PHRASES

- ἀγαπᾶν, 258<sup>f</sup>  
 ἅγιον, τό, 199  
 ἀδελφός, 186, 192, 251  
 ἀλλά, 80<sup>ff</sup>, 86, 87  
 ἀμήν, 84  
 βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, 30 n, 102<sup>f</sup>  
 βροχή, 124  
 γέεννα, 182<sup>ff</sup>  
 δικαιοσύνη, 92, 93  
 εἰρηνοποιός, 174  
 ἐλεήμων, 174  
 ἔνοχος, 185  
 ἐχθρός, 85, 191<sup>f</sup>  
 ἱμάτιον, 190  
 Ἰουδαία, 51  
 καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, 175  
 κρίνειν, 196<sup>f</sup>  
 κρίσις, 85, 183<sup>ff</sup>  
 κύριος, 204  
 κύων, 97, 199<sup>ff</sup>  
 μαθητής, 43<sup>f</sup>, 49<sup>f</sup>  
 μακάριος, 176<sup>f</sup>, 246<sup>ff</sup>  
 Μωρέ, 182, 185  
 Ναὶ ναί, 187<sup>f</sup>  
 οἰκτίρμων, 115<sup>f</sup>  
 ὄρος, τό, 44, 51  
 πατήρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, 112<sup>f</sup>  
 πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος, 57<sup>f</sup>, 116  
 πενθεῖν, 172<sup>f</sup>  
 πληροῦν, 179  
 πλούσιος, 175<sup>f</sup>  
 πονηρός, ὁ, 88, 188, 189, 193<sup>f</sup>  
 πρᾶς, 170<sup>f</sup>  
 προσκαλεσάμενος, 43  
 πτωχός, 79, 102, 170<sup>ff</sup>, 264  
 Ῥακά, 182  
 σαπρός, 203  
 συνέδριον, 182<sup>ff</sup>  
 τέλειος, 115<sup>f</sup>  
 ὑποκριτής, 198  
 χιτῶν, 190  
 χοῖρος, 97, 199<sup>ff</sup>





## INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND AUTHORS

- ABRAHAM, DR. ISRAEL, 164*n*, 181  
 Adultery, law of, 186*f*, 251*f*  
 Allen, Canon W. C., 11*n*, 13*n*, 22, 103  
 Assumptions as to the Synoptic Gospels, 2  
 Augustine, St., 187, 255
- BARTLET, DR. J. V., 10*n*  
 Box, Canon G. H., 181*n*  
 Büchler, Dr., 94*f*  
 Builders, the two, 121*ff*, 204*f*, 212, 260*f*
- CHARLES, ARCHD. R. H., 141  
 City set on a Hill, 75*f*
- DALMAN, GUSTAV H., 84, 103, 109, 112, 113, 125 (bis), 178 (bis), 196  
 Darwin, Charles, 243  
 Decalogue, the, and the Beatitudes, 77  
 Delitzsch, 199, 204  
 Discrimination, duty of, 138, 198*ff*  
 Documentary Hypothesis, 3*ff*  
 Doublets in Mt., 5-7, 58*ff*  
 Driver, S. R., 102, 170, 175
- EDERSHEIM, A., 179, 200*n*, 203*n*, 205
- GARDNER, DR. PERCY, 248*n*  
 Golden Rule. *See under* Rule
- HARNACK, PROF. A., 9*n*, 17, 106  
 Hawkins, Sir J. C., 6, 9*n*, 17*n*, 18, 19, 22, 23, 61*f*, 65, 68*f*, 81, 118 (bis)
- IDENTITIES OF LANGUAGE, 3*ff*
- JAMES, EP. OF, Affinities of the Sermon with, 222  
 Judging others forbidden, 116*ff*, 195*ff*, 211
- KENYON, SIR F. G., 5*n*, 7*n*
- LIGHTFOOT, DR. JOHN, 74, 180, 181, 182 (bis), 183, 185, 186*n*, 190, 196*f*, 198, 203*n*  
 Lightfoot, Bp. J. B., 202*n*  
 Limitations of the Sermon, 206*ff*  
 Love and Hatred, law of, 112*ff*, 191*ff*, 211, 258*f*, 262*f*  
 Luke, sources of his Gospel, 10 ; fidelity to Mark's order, 14*ff* ; two large interpolations, 17 ; Passion narrative, 19 ; small transpositions of Marcan matter, 19*f* ; preference for Q's version, 21*n*, 22 ; omission of Marcan discourse matter, 22 ; fondness for triads of sayings, 88*ff*  
 Lyttelton, the Hon. E., 198*n*
- MARK, treatment of, by Mt. and Lk., 7*f*, 11*f* ; abrupt ending of, 10*f* ; treatment of, by Mt., 13*f* ; treatment of, by Lk., 14*ff* ; extent of reproduction of, by Mt. and Lk., 21 ; extent of reproduction of wording of, by Mt. and Lk., 25*ff* ; chronological order of contents of, 48*f*  
 Matthew, transpositions of Mark's sections, 13, 14 ; topical grouping of matter, 14, 74*f*, 135*f* ; conflations of Mark and Q, 16 ; doublets in, 16 ; small transpositions of Marcan matter, 18*f* ; preference for discourse, 21*f*, 43 ; source of his non-Markan matter, 22 ; omissions from Mark's discourse, 89*f*

Montefiore, C. G., 93, 178*n*, 196*n*,  
247*f*, 250, 259  
Murder, law of, 108*f*, 180*ff*

NIETZSCHE, F., 233, 243*ff*  
Non-Resistance to Evil, 109*ff*, 189*ff*,  
254*ff*

OATHS, Law of, 187*ff*, 252*ff*  
Oral Hypothesis, 3  
— Traditions, 6  
Origen, 84

PAPIAS, and the *Logia* of Mt., 9, 22,  
29, 133  
—, and Mark, 48, 137  
Papyrus Rolls, length of, 7

Q, a document, 3*ff*; probably a single  
source, 8*ff*; style and subject-matter,  
9; question of different recensions of,  
11*f*; probable order of, 13*ff*; Marcan  
matter in; 14, 15, 16*n*, 24; detailed  
order of, 18–20; probable extent of,  
21*ff*, 61*ff*, 65; characteristics of,  
23; probable wording of, 25*ff*; criteria  
of originality, 29*f*

RAMSAY, SIR W. M., 5*n*  
Rashdall, Hastings, 258  
Retaliation, law of, 189*ff*, 252*ff*  
Revision of Moral Standards, 80*ff*,  
179*ff*, 249*ff*  
Robinson, Dean Armitage, 96  
Rolls, length of Papyrus, 7  
Rule, the Golden, 61*ff*, 111*f*, 159, 191,  
211, 230, 257*f*

SANDAY, W., 7*n*, 170, 240, 257  
Savage, Dean H. E., 188, 190*n*, 197*n*,  
198*n*, 199*n*

Saying and Doing, 120*f*, 204, 212  
Sermon, the: Luke's introduction to,  
14; limitations of, 206*ff*, 223; importance  
of, 209*ff*; parallels in the Gospels,  
209*ff*; parallels in the rest of the N.T.,  
212*ff*; predominant affinities of, 222,  
232; greatness and importance of,  
223*ff*; relation to Christ's early teaching,  
224*f*; possible influences on our Lord's  
mind, 225*ff*; how far original, 229*ff*;  
message to our own age, 261*ff*  
Streeter, Canon B. H., 9*n*, 14*n*, 15, 16*n*,  
17*n*, 56, 137  
Strong, Bp. T. B., 208*n*  
Suffering, prominence of the idea of,  
193*ff*

TEACHING, the, of Christ: the *Interimsethik*  
theory, 234*ff*; how far eschatological,  
236*ff*; the charge of onesidedness,  
239*ff*; reasons for its incompleteness,  
241*f*; the strictures of Nietzsche, 242*f*;  
strength of its appeal, 244*f*  
Thornton, L. S., 245*n*  
Tree, the good and the bad, 118*ff*, 203,  
260  
Trench, Archbp., 183*f*, 185 (bis), 187,  
260  
Triplet in Matthew, 9  
Turner, Mr. C. H., 48

VARIATIONS of Language, how  
accounted for, 6, 7

WELLHAUSEN, J., 11  
Wetstein, J. J., 197  
Writing, prevalence of, in the first  
century, 5









FEB 20 1996		
DEC 20 1995		
DEC 20 1995		
JAN 8 2000		
DEC 13 1999		
MAY 8 2002		
APR 14 2002		
JUN 25 2009		
MAY 21 2009		
FEB 13 2017		
DEC 17 2017		
JUL 7 2015		

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



GTU Library  
2400 Ridge Road  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
For renewals call (510) 649-2500  
All items are subject to recall.



